VOLUME VI NUMBER 1

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

JANUARY 1932

EDITORIAL

ALTHOUGH THE MENNONITES AS A GROUP HAVE LIVED A LIFE somewhat apart from the rest of the world and have manifested a very strong spirit of group solidarity and group consciousness, they have after all lived as a part of the general society in which they have found themselves. At times some Mennonites have almost succeeded in deluding themselves into the belief that they have been so "separate from the world" as to have been relatively uninfluenced by it. Even Mennonite history has been written occasionally from this point of view. The point of view is of course impossible. Staunchly independent as they have been, Mennonite communities and Mennonite community life have nevertheless been conditioned to a greater or less extent by the larger society of which they were and are a part. Since much of Mennonite historiography has not proceeded far beyond the stage of mere chronicle, little has been done to uncover and expound the interacting relationships between Mennonites and their environment. John Umble's discussion of the Fairfield County, Ohio, background of the Allen County, Ohio, Mennonite settlement is an interesting and valuable essay from this point of view. His article suggests many leads to be followed up. It gives perspective to Mennonite history by picturing, in part at least, the social scene on which Mennonite community life was projected a century ago in post-revolutionary Ohio. At the same time, the article is a real contribution to the history of the oldest Mennonite settlement west of Pennsylvania, the first in Ohio, although it does not pretend to be exhaustive. Professor Umble will follow this essay with an account of the Allen county settlement in the next issue.

It is a new type of Anabaptists with whom Professor C. Eden Quainton, of the University of Washington, acquaints us in his most interesting story of "The Anabaptists in England During the Commonwealth." Are they really Anabaptists? The author believes they can trace their spiritual ancestry to Menno Simons and the Dutch Anabaptists, and this is no doubt true. However, from the point of view of their political activism and their revolutionary zeal, these English Anabaptists had "descended" a considerable distance from the original nonresistant faith of Menno Simons and the Dutch Brethren. Hence, care should be taken to avoid confusion of these militant saints of Cromwellian England and the peaceful brethren of typical Anabaptism on the continent. The affinity with the Muensterites is certainly quite clear. Professor Quainton's stimulating contribution raises many questions about the English Anabaptist movement. What is its genetic connection with Dutch Anabaptism, or is there none, as English Baptist historians insist. When and how did English Anabaptism become militant? What was the relation between the "Saints" and the "Baptists," and similar groups? Further contributions on the history of English Anabaptism will be very welcome.

Documentary sources on early American Mennonite history are excessively rare. Readers may therefore imagine the pleasure with which the Review presents a most interesting contemporary document describing the religious life and practice of American Mennonites of a hundred years ago. An interesting characteristic of the documents is the author's very earnest endeavor to observe accurately and report impartially the material of his observations. The commendable modesty and well-balanced good judgment shown in the comments greatly enhance the value of the story. Jacob Krehbiel deserves a medal from the Mennonite Historical Society for having preserved his impressions of American Mennonites for posterity.

One could wish that Krehbiel's account would have covered a wider field. If he had only written a book instead of a brief essay! For instance, he might have given detailed descriptions of the leaders of the Church in his time instead of brief, almost tantalizing references to what were undoubtedly the outstanding men of his age, Benjamin Eby, Peter Eby, and Christian Herr. He might have described the costume worn by laity and preachers, instead of merely referring to it. He might have enumerated the conferences in existence in 1840, and described their sessions. But

(Continued on page 64)

THE FAIRFIELD COUNTY, OHIO, BACKGROUND OF THE ALLEN COUNTY, OHIO, MENNONITE SETTLEMENT, 1799-1860

JOHN UMBLE

Until the detailed early history of Fairfield county, Ohio, Mennonites is written, complete understanding of the causes of their emigration to Allen county will be difficult, if not impossible. Even a brief presentation of some of the available facts, however, will enable the student to appreciate the difficulties and hardships under which Mennonite leaders labored in that section during the early pioneer days and the social, economic, religious, and cultural phenomena that caused the exodus of entire congregations to the vicinity of Elida, Ohio, between 1831 and approximately 1865.

After the treaty of Greenville in 1795 by which among other Indian tribes the Wyandots and Delawares agreed to relinquish their claim to southern and eastern Ohio and to remove to the northwestern quarter of what is now that state, pioneers began to filter into the forest wildernesses along the Ohio river tributaries from the rapidly overcrowding settlements in Kentucky and Tennessee. In order to induce immigration into the interior, Congress in 1797 employed Ebenezer Zane to open a road through the primeval forest from Wheeling, West Virginia, through what is now Zanesville, Lancaster, and Chillicothe, Ohio, to Maysville, Kentucky. His task was not to make a road, but simply to open up a wide path through the woods. This stump-obstructed trail was known as Zane's Trace. Soon afterward, instead of coming to Pittsburgh from the East by wagon, reloading on flatboats, drifting down the Ohio to the mouth of the Muskingum, Hocking, or Scioto rivers, then reloading on dug-outs or canoes, and rowing or poling up one of these rivers, the emigrant could load his property and his family on wagons in New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, or Maryland and drive through by way of Pittsburgh and Wheeling to one of the growing settlements on Zane's Trace.

First to arrive was the trader, the hunter, or pioneer who can hardly be said to have lived on the frontier. It would be more

nearly correct to say that he kept ahead of it. For as soon as he could see the smoke from a settler's cabin rise above the trees on the summit of a neighboring hilltop, he felt cramped for room, and moved on into the wilderness. With the arrival of the settler the real conquest of the forest began. He was forced to protect his live stock and many times his own life against bears, wolves, and panthers, while wild turkeys, deer, squirrels and raccoons sought to destroy his growing crops struggling to come to maturity among the blackened trunks of the deadened trees in the so-called "clearing." The forest was so dense that in some cases it was necessary for him to "blaze" the trees from the cabin to the cornfield or to the spring where he watered his cattle. "Blazing" was cutting the bark off two sides of a tree to indicate the direction of a path or road.

These were the conditions under which the first Mennonite families moved into Fairfield county soon after 1800. Most of the early settlers in that section were Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, emigrants, speaking a German dialect called Pennsylvania Dutch. In spite of the terrible hardship and open lawlessness incident to every American frontier, a few of these people organized religious societies at a very early date. Even before 1800 a Methodist class meeting had been organized on Zane's Trace three miles east of New Lancaster (now Lancaster) and the hard-working, consecrated Methodist circuit-rider at once began his monthly rounds preaching in the little log-cabins with their oiled-paper windows and using a homemade bench or "chair" for a pulpit. By this time Methodism had regained the favor with the American public that had been lost during the Revolutionary War on account of the Tory leanings of Francis Asbury and other American Methodist leaders. Their technique for following their members into new settlements, their emphasis on evangelism, their spirited preaching, and intense insistence on practical morality gave them superior advantages for the conquest of the frontier. The first Ohio Methodist camp-meeting, greatest of all evangelizing agencies on the American frontier, was held near Lancaster in 1806 or 1807 and continued its annual sessions for many years, gathering into the Methodist fold young and old of all classes. But, because most of the Methodists were English-speaking and their services were conducted in English, they did not compete for the interest and attention of Mennonite young people so much in the early days as they did later. Few names of undoubted Mennonite origin occur in Methodist church records in Fairfield county until after the Civil War.

Poorly as the Presbyterian church polity was adapted to take advantage of frontier conditions, the Rev. John Wright settled in Lancaster in 1801 and soon organized a congregation. With its emphasis on a "holy and learned clergy" that made many years of preparation necessary and consequently called for a substantial salary, the Presbyterian church usually awaited a formal ministerial call by a group financially able to give a pastor proper support before sending him to the frontier. The early establishment of this Presbyterian congregation is therefore not quite clear. But at an early date it played an important part in the life of the settlements in Fairfield county. For many years, however, it had little influence on the Mennonite colony. Its English services and cultural background made little appeal to Mennonite young people during the first generation. Later, however, when the public schools had anglicized the entire community and when the Presbyterian church introduced the Sunday school and other young people's activities, Mennonite boys and girls were attracted to Presbyterian services. Daniel Brenneman and other young Mennonites attended this Sunday school in the fifties or early sixties.

The Baptist church, founded in Pleasant township in 1806 with Martin Coffman as moderator, seems to have been made up in part of members proselyted among Rockingham county, Virginia, Mennonites. At any rate many of them came from that settlement. Of the ninety members of the Pleasant Run (Baptist) church in 1809 fourteen bear such well-known Mennonite names as Coffman, Giger (Geiger), Cagy (Keagy), Wise, Miller, Musselman, Hover (Hoover), and Histand (Hiestand). These had no doubt been swept into the Baptist church during the period of the Great Awakening in Virginia. In spite of the proximity of the Baptist colony to the Mennonite settlement a little farther south and of their evident blood relationship to both Dunkards and Mennonites, evidence is lacking of any close contact between Baptists and Mennonites during the early years. Here again the language barrier intervened for at least a third of a century.

Many of the Lancaster county, Pennsylvania, settlers in Fairfield county were members of the Lutheran and German Reformed churches. Although these, as well as the Mennonites and Brethren, were interested in the German public schools where the German Testament was the chief textbook during the first decade or two, creedal and cultural differences kept the groups apart to some extent. Except in the beginning, when frontier life tended to obliterate lines of social cleavage and when eligible young people of mar-

riageable age were few, there was very little intermarriage between Mennonites and members of other German religious groups. The effect on the Mennonites of the division in the Lutheran churches of Fairfield county about 1840 on the question of introducing English into the religious services does not seem clear. But, since the first major exodus of Mennonites occurred about the time that the language question was causing difficulty in other denominations, it seems reasonable to conclude that the same problem affected the peace and prosperity of the Mennonite church.

Because Mennonites in general at the beginning of the nineteenth century made no provision for the public instruction and indoctrination of their boys and girls, because they seldom encouraged young people to unite with the Church before marriage, and because their preaching dealt with doctrine and ethics rather than evangelism, they have frequently suffered from the inroads of the proselyter. Fairfield county Mennonites were no exception. When the Evangelical Association (Albrecht's Leute) sent a missionary into Fairfield county in 1816 with a creed and doctrine, mode of worship, church government, and intineracy very much like the Methodists, but carried on in German, numbers of the Mennonite young people united with the new denomination which seems to have conducted an annual German camp meeting at a very early date. About 1850 the Pennsylvania German element of the Evangelical Association in Fairfield county yielded their preference in language for the sake of saving their young people. Henceforward they conducted most of their services in English. This again had a marked influence on the Mennonite church that in some sections still attempted to carry on in German.

The United Brethren church is another denomination that has had considerable success in attracting young people of Mennonite parentage. This is true also in Fairfield county where United Brethren congregations were organized near to the earliest Mennonite settlements. Entire families left their Mennonite affiliations to enter the more liberal atmosphere of the United Brethren communion where many of the principles of the early Mennonite fathers were no longer regarded. Among these are non-swearing of oaths, non-participation in war either offensive or defensive, living and practicing the simple life, proper emphasis on spiritual values and on selection of occupational activities that agree with biblical standards as taught by Mennonites. Every war has been a period of testing and sifting and at such times more young Mennonites united with other denominations than at any other time.

The War of 1812-14 and the Civil War were no exceptions to this rule. Numbers of young men of Mennonite parentage in Fairfield county lacked the strength to disregard the mid-century equivalent of the World War sneer of "Slacker!" or "Yellowback!" and eased their conscience by uniting with a denomination that denied the faith of their Mennonite ancestors.

Different, but almost equally disastrous to the growth of the Mennonite church, were the early relations of the Mennonites and Dunkards. Probably no other one denomination has made such serious inroads into the membership of the Mennonite church as has the Dunkard. Perhaps no other group of equal size has emigrated to America with so small a membership in the beginning or has been recruited more largely from the ranks of another denomination. In the early history of Fairfield county they looked, spoke, and believed like Mennonites except in regard to baptism (they practiced trine immersion) and the celebration of the Lord's supper. They wore the Quaker garb and usually wore their beards long. For some reason they found little difficulty in recruiting members among young men and women of Mennonite parentage or even from the membership of Mennonite congregations. This seems to have been especially true, not only in Pennsylvania and Virginia, but also in Fairfield after both groups became established there. One reason for the easy transition from Mennonite to Dunkard probably lies in blood relationship that often linked the two groups. When the Brethren (Dunkard) congregation was organized in 1809 by members of that denomination living among the Mennonites of what is now Rush Creek township, eighteen of the twenty-five charter members have such well-known Mennonite names as Hufford, Beery, Hunsaker, and Stoner (Steiner). Later ministers included Daniel Snyder, Michael Moore, and Abraham Stemen, names still common among the descendants of Fairfield county Mennonites. Prior to 1877 three Dunkard meetinghouses had been built in the valley south and southwest of Bremen, but, at that time, through emigration to other states and loss of members to other denominations the membership had dwindled to seventy communicants. Few members now (1932) remain and the declension continues.

Still another denomination that was closely associated with the Mennonites in Fairfield was the River Brethren (Brethren in Christ). The writer has no means of knowing whether or not they were among the first arrivals or whether certain Mennonites and Dunkards were proselyted to that faith. It is certain, however,

that some of the later members of the River Brethren were descended from the first Stalters, Huddles, Mussers, and Beerys. Preacher Christian Stalter's mother had been a Miss Sheaffer. Hence it seems probable that his father was the Christley Stalter who emigrated to Fairfield from York county, Pennsylvania, in 1801 with Samuel Sheaffer. Preacher Christian Stalter appears to have been an elder in the River Brethren church in Fairfield county. Far back in log-cabin days he made extended pastoral trips that sometimes led him into Kentucky. Christian's brother, John Stalter, and the former's son, Christian Nathaniel Stalter, moved to Allen county at an early date. The latter married a granddaughter of Bishop Henry Stemen. Although there was no River Brethren congregation in Allen county these two pious old people remained members of that denomination so long as they lived. They were the grandparents of Miss Anna Stalter (old) Mennonite missionary to India.

River Brethren and Mennonites, like Dunkards and Mennonites, had considerable difficulty in living peaceably together. The River Brethren emphasized a personal experience of heart religion and in the early days always opened their services with a testimony meeting in which members were given opportunity to testify to, and present instances of, the power of God in their daily lives. Just as Dunkards consider the Mennonite mode of baptism unscriptural and inadequate, so River Brethren accused Mennonites of formalism and coldness in their religious services and, in some cases, of attempting to substitute mere church membership for real heart religion. The total net result of this barrage of questioning criticism was to keep religious matters in a state of ferment and to lead some Mennonites to question the validity of their religion so that they became a prey to doubt and indecision.

There were other disturbing factors. The camp meetings of the Methodists and the Evangelicals (Albrechts-leute) and the revivals of the Presbyterians and Baptists, however helpful they may have been in arousing the religious conscience, in restraining lawlessness and vice, and in preventing the development of a godless paganism on the frontier, they nevertheless created much religious unrest and dissatisfaction among Mennonites and other religious groups. The ordinary decencies of human association sometimes suffered violation. Defending himself against the charge that he was not a Christian, a certain Mennonite asserted that he was a member of the Church and in good standing. From the non-Mennonite enthusiast the retort came back: "Ja, du bist ein

Mennist, aber du bist kein Christ." Groundless as this and similar accusations many times were, they nevertheless added to the religious unrest and need to be taken into account in any study of the development of Mennonite religious societies on the frontier.

The first Mennonite settler in Fairfield county seems to have been Martin Landis, Sr. He had visited the Hocking Valley and Zane's Trace in 1798. He returned with his family in 1799 and settled two miles south of Lancaster. The next year he moved to what is now Madison township. He entered land in the Chillicothe land-office for Henry, Samuel, Katy, and Sara Shellenbarger, also. Michael Shellenbarger too was already living there when Christley Stalter arrived from York county, Pennsylvania, the next year (1801). A little later came George Buzzard and John, Nicholas, and Daniel Conrad. Valentine Reber (Raber) settled a few miles west in 1803. In 1805 John Iric and John Pannebaker lived a few miles north. In 1806 David Swope, John Hoover, and Isaac Huffer lived a short distance northwest of Martin Landis. In 1816 a list of patrons of a public school includes the names of Simeon Bixler and Jacob Iric among some of the foregoing. In 1806 the township in which Martin Landis resided listed one hundred forty-one taxpayers, including in addition to some of the above: Andrew, Henry, David, and Jacob Buzzard; Daniel Conrad, Jr.; Peter Culp; Jacob, Frederick, and Jacob (II) Hoffman; Christian Myers; Christian Stuckey; John Sharrack (Sherrick); Jacob and John Shoemaker. Some of these are known to have been Mennonites.

The Mennonites were the first to organize a congregation in this community. An early settler remembered them as the "Menese" (sic), a name still remembered for the German form "Menist," or "Mennonist," in most of the counties of Ohio where Mennonite congregations have disappeared. For some time they met for worship in the bar-room of the Leather's House, a tavern several miles south of Lancaster. In a short time, however, Martin Landis, Sr., built a two-story meetinghouse of hewed logs that was in use for many years and was still standing about 1870. It was a commodious building for that time, about twenty by thirty feet. Although it was called the "Mennonite meetinghouse," Martin Landis' broad, charitable religious views permitted ministers of other denominations to use it for preaching services. The Rev. Mr. Stake (probably Steck), Lutheran, of Lancaster, often preached in it.

Meanwhile in another township, ten or fifteen miles northeast of this settlement in Clear Creek, Berne, and Amanda townships, another Mennonite settlement had begun in Richland township and in what is now Rush Creek township. In the beginning most of the new settlers were either descended from, or related by marriage to, the immigrants, Nicholas and Abraham Beery, who had arrived in Philadelphia in 1727 and 1736 respectively. The latter settled in Adams county, Pennsylvania. As his sons grew to manhood they emigrated to Virginia and settled in the Shenandoah valley whither he followed them in 1787. There he died in 1799 five miles southeast of Harrisonburg. He and his wife, Mary Gochenour, were Mennonites. Nicholas also moved to Rockingham county, Virginia, and was living there in 1873. Available records do not indicate whether or not Nicholas was a Mennonite, nor whether he and Abraham were brothers. However some of the same Christian names appear in both families. Abraham's sons were, Abraham, Nicholas, John, Jacob, and George. Nicholas' sons by his first marriage were John, Isaac, Abraham, Jacob, Henry, and George. Four of Nicholas' sons have already been mentioned above as charter members of the Dunkard church established in the vicinity of Bremen in 1809.

George, son of Nicholas, was the first of the Beerys to arrive in Fairfield. He came, a seventeen year old boy, in 1800. Instead of following Zane's Trace from Wheeling to Lancaster, he took the earlier route down the Ohio by flatboat to the mouth of the Hocking, then up that river to the falls of the Hocking, where Logan, Hocking county, now stands, and thence up the river to Lancaster. During the summer of 1800 and the following winter he cleared land at so much per acre. He returned to Virginia in the spring but came back to Fairfield in the fall of 1801. By clearing land and working for others, he finally saved enough money to enter eighty acres on Raccoon creek near Bremen in 1807. Two years later he married the daughter of the Rev. Cradlebaugh, a German Reformed minister, who had been a Revolutionary soldier and had emigrated to western Pennsylvania soon after the war closed. In 1805 George Beery's brother, John, settled in Fairfield and the others followed soon after. These, with their brother-in-law Casper Hufford and others, founded the Dunker congregation in the Raccoon settlement south of Bremen already mentioned. At first they held services in their log-cabin residences.

Among the first Mennonites to emigrate to the Raccoon and Rush creek region in Fairfield county was Henry Stemen, son of

Christian Stehmann, probably of Lancaster county, Pennsylvania. He moved to Rockingham county, Virginia, with his parents and there married Nicholas Beery's daughter, Mary, sister of the Beery brothers who were charter members of the aforementioned Dunkard congregation. Henry Stemen and his bride, soon after their marriage, moved to Red Stone, Pennsylvania, in Greene (Fayette?) county, and from there in 1803 to Richland township in the eastern part of Fairfield county near his wife's brothers and sisters. In the same year his older brother, Peter Stemen, moved from Rockingham county, Virginia, to Fayette county, Pennsylvania, and in 1807, followed Henry to Fairfield. In the same year in which the Dunkard congregation was organized (1809) Henry Stemen was ordained to the ministry in the Fairfield county Mennonite church. His brother, Peter, seems to have been ordained deacon at the same time. Who ordained them, is not known. A complete list of charter members of the eastern Fairfield county Mennonite congregation is not available, but the tax list of Richland, Berne, and Pleasant townships, from which Rush creek township was later organized, carries the following names which probably were Mennonite: Andrew Sherrick, George Blosser, George Bowman, George Bearge (Berkey or Bergey), Henry Orendors (Orendorf?), Theobald Musser, Peter Whitmer, Christian Hoover, John Siegler (Ziegler?), Henry Bowman, Elizabeth Fry, Daniel Moyer, Abraham Moyer, John, David, Samuel, and Henry Shellenbarger.

The relation between the Clear Creek township Mennonites and those in the eastern part of the county is not quite clear, but there is some evidence that the latter formed the chief part of the congregation. They were very strict in not allowing their children to attend play parties. This, however, was true also of a number of other denominations. Until the history of Fairfield county Mennonites is written, the exact relation of the two communities will not be clear; but they probably formed one congregation with two meetinghouses as was often the case on the frontier. There is some evidence that the southwestern group fell into decline and that the River Brethren, as indicated above, profited by this situation by proselyting some of the members. Competition was keen among the various denominations. The Presbyterians, led by the Rev. John Wright of Lancaster had erected a hewed-log church in the Rush creek settlement near Bremen about 1807. German Reformed, Methodists, and Seceders were also on the ground very early. The Mennonites in their quiet way laid most stress on

gathering in their own children and did no aggressive evangelistic work. They clung tenaciously to their faith but made little effort to impose it on others.

Families continued to arrive rapidly and the settlement grew. Isaac Blosser came in 1811. There was considerable intermarrying among the Stemens, Conrads, Blossers, Myers and Lehmans (or Laman as the name was spelled in Fairfield county and later in Allen). Andrew Stemen, later a deacon in Allen, married Jane Saegemueller (later spelled Sakemiller or Sawmiller) of a Lutheran family, but both of them became Mennonites. Intermarriage of young Mennonites with members of the Dunkard or German Reformed church usually meant loss of membership in the Mennonite church. Numbers of Mennonite young people united with the United Brethren church after marrying outside of the church of their fathers. Samuel, the youngest son of Bishop Henry Stemen, however, married a Hillyard and both united with the Mennonite church.

In 1816 the Mennonite church in Fairfield gained an important accession to membership from its old home in Rockingham county, Virginia. In that year George Beery, fifth son of the pioneer immigrant, Abraham Beery, followed his cousins across the mountains to make his home with the Mennonite congregation of his cousin's husband, Henry Stemen. He and his wife with their seven children made the long trip by team and wagon over the mountains from Virginia to Perry county, Ohio (adjoining Fairfield county), but moved soon after to Fairfield county. His eldest daughter, Barbara, and her husband, Henry Brenneman, parents of the well-known Brenneman brothers, accompanied them to their new western home. Henry's brother, Jacob, followed in 1828.

George Beery's wife was Susan Funk, sister to Joseph Funk, noted singing-school teacher of Singers Glen, Rockingham county, Virginia. She and her husband and all their children were Mennonites. Their fourth daughter, however, in 1826 married David C. Young of an old Presbyterian family, and nearly all his descendants are United Brethren, Methodist Episcopal, or Presbyterian. Among the descendants of the remaining children of George and Susan (Funk) Beery are many of the outstanding ministers and leaders of the Mennonite church in the last half of the nineteenth century. Their eldest daughter, wife of the Henry Brenneman mentioned above, became the mother of John M., George, Henry B., and Daniel Brenneman, names known to every student of recent Mennonite history. John M., and George were leading

bishops in the Ohio conference for many years. Henry B., was deacon in the Elkhart, Indiana, congregation and a prominent Sunday school worker, and Daniel was the founder of the Mennonite Brethren in Christ church. Among George and Susan Beery's descendants are such well-known names as Dr. Henry A. Mumaw, founder of the *Words of Cheer* in 1876 and the Elkhart Institute in 1894; Bishops John M. and Andrew Shenk, and J. K. Bixler; and Preachers Daniel Shenk, Amos Mumaw, Silas Weldy, and many others.

The youngest sister and the youngest brother of Susanna (Funk) Beery became, with their families, the founders of a new, but now extinct, Mennonite congregation in Union township, Logan county, Ohio, not far from the late home of the Amish bishop, David Plank. This sister, Frances Funk, married Henry Culp and with fifteen children and grandchildren moved in 1831 from Rockingham county, Virginia, to Logan county, Ohio, in a wagon drawn by a three-horse team. After the father's death in 1838 his son, Christian, returned to Fairfield county where he married Elizabeth Good, sister of Bishop John M. Brenneman's wife, Sophia. Christian Culp was ordained to the ministry in Fairfield in 1846, moved to Elida in 1852, and for many years was a leader among the conservative forces of the Salem congregation.

Frances (Funk) Culp's youngest brother, Daniel, also moved his family to the wilds of the western part of Union township, Logan county, Ohio, following his brother-in-law in 1832. Here, about 1840, he was ordained minister, and later bishop. He lived here, with his sons and daughters, nephews and nieces, and their children, until after the Amish arrived in the county and organized a congregation. For some reason he and most of his congregation moved to Owen county, Indiana, in 1853. There a number of his descendants became Mennonite ministers and deacons. Some of his descendants united with the German Baptist (Dunkard) church in Logan county, and a number of their descendants still reside in Bellefontaine and West Liberty.

Martin Funk, a nephew of Susanna Beery, Frances Culp, and their brother, Bishop Daniel Funk, illustrates the trend of Mennonite immigration in the early days, but his frequent removals are certainly not the rule. Martin's father, John, was born in Montgomery county, Pennsylvania, and moved with his parents to Rockingham county, Virginia, in 1800 where Martin's eldest son was born in 1826. His second and third sons were born in Perry county, Ohio, adjoining Fairfield, in 1828 and 1830; a daughter,

Sarah, in Logan county, Ohio, in 1833; a second daughter and another son in Allen county, Ohio, in 1836 and 1840; his two youngest children (daughters) in Henry county, Indiana, in 1844 and 1847. By 1853 some married members of his family were living in Harrison county, Missouri, and the others seem to have followed in a few years. Some did not leave Henry county, Indiana, until 1872. Martin Funk died there in 1881. Scores of his descendants still live in their Missouri home. A few are Mennonites, an equal number are German Baptists, but a large number are Methodists.

Economic conditions seem to have been a large factor in the settling of the West and this was true also of Fairfield county, Ohio. Many of those who left their eastern homes were bankrupt. Post-revolutionary conditions were trying and difficult beyond the power of imaginative reconstruction. Worthless currency, a ruined foreign commerce, low prices for produce, left many a prosperous farmer destitute. Disheartened, he loaded the wreck of his former prosperity on a wagon and migrated to the forests of Virginia or western Pennsylvania to begin life anew. Then in 1795 the Greenville treaty made eastern and southern Ohio comparatively secure from Indian attacks. In the same year a treaty with Spain opened the Mississippi river to the Yankee trader. Land companies purchased millions of acres of land and painted the prospects of the new western empire in glowing colors to the land-hungry farmer of the East with his growing family and a desire to leave a farm to each of his numerous children. Roads were opened; towns were laid out. An astounding stream of settlers poured westward. Flatboats took produce down the Ohio and Mississippi rivers and the trader came riding back with his bag of Spanish silver dollars. The few of these that found their way into the settlements usually became "cut money," and the frontiersman soon learned how to cut a Spanish dollar into five "quarters."

The amazing rapidity with which Fairfield county was settled may be judged by the taxpayer's list in 1806. In April, 1798, the first actual settler, John Hunter, arrived and made his permanent home within the present limits of the county. In 1806, one thousand five hundred and fifty-one taxpayers paid a total of $1,011.64\frac{1}{3}$ in taxes. Allowing the modest estimate of five persons for each taxpayer the total population would be over 7,700 and that is probably too low.

The tax list conveys some idea also of the financial standing of these early settlers. The highest taxpayer enriched the county treasury by $17.72\frac{1}{2}$ on a total valuation of all property real and personal of $3,907. The next highest was $13.00; a few in Lancaster paid ten, but no one outside of Lancaster paid over four. The lowest assessment was eight cents and by far the larger number of persons paid less than one dollar. It needs to be remembered in this connection that the house was assessed separately from the land under the Ohio laws of that period and that the minimum was one hundred dollars. No Mennonite resident of Fairfield county at that time was assessed as much as $1000, including his house. Undoubtedly a fourth or fifth of that figure would be more nearly correct for many of them.

The two or three dollars tax, which the settler was obliged to pay in hard cash it was often almost impossible to get. On one occasion so many settlers were unable to meet the deferred payments on their land that Ebenezer Zane became interested and helped them to raise the necessary sum. Some lost their land outright and, after it had reverted to the government, they slaved for years to redeem it. During the early years one farmer harvested less than a peck of good corn from three acres. The squirrels ate it in daytime as the ears began to fill and the raccoons preyed on it at night. He shot thirty-eight squirrels in one tree on the edge of his field. Enterprising Martin Landis, Sr., drove a large herd of fat cattle to Virginia in 1812. When he was within twenty-five miles of Washington City, the British burned the capitol and in the confusion that followed he was obliged to sell the cattle at such a tremendous sacrifice that he never recovered his losses.

In spite of various handicaps, however, Mennonite settlers continued to arrive, the log cabins gave way to large Lancaster county three-story houses set into the hillsides so that the second story was the ground floor at the back. And the two-story log barns were replaced with Lancaster county "bank barns" with huge joists hewn out of native timber.

The usual after-war crash that followed the War of 1812 had its effect on the Mennonites of Fairfield. Their thrift and industry had enabled some of them to clear and improve their farms so that many were in comfortable circumstances in spite of the low prices and lack of markets for their produce. Some lost their holdings and were forced to begin life anew in the virgin forest on the

less desirable hillsides and narrow creek bottoms in Perry county where for months in the year the roads were practically impassable.

Conditions in the East were so much worse, however, that the easterner gladly accepted the land-agent's glowing pictures of the greatness of the future western empire. The activity of the land-agent as a factor in swelling the tide of western immigration is easily underestimated. He was a member of a well-organized group that had developed a technique for making frontier lands accessible and for attracting the easterner. He not only secured land-grants, but he controlled legislation and congress itself. He secured large levies for opening roads and, later, canals, post-roads, turnpikes, and railroads that were heavily subsidized by the state or federal government. At all events the valleys of the Ohio river and its tributaries continued to receive an ever increasing number of immigrants. Fairfield county attracted a large number.

In 1815 the U. S. government awarded a contract for the transportation of mail from Pittsburgh to Maysville, Kentucky, over Zane's Trace. The boy who rode the section from Lancaster to Zanesville and back often rode all night in order to make connections. He forded the streams that were fordable and crossed the rivers on canoes changing horses on both sides. In 1817 open box wagons were put on the roads to transport the mail and after that the contract called for carrying the mail six months by wagon and six by horseback riders. Stage coaches were introduced on the route in 1820 and brought the frontier many days nearer to the settler's old home in the east. All these events and improvements tended to the growth of the Mennonite colony in Fairfield up to a certain point. But when the roads were opened to new lands farther west, the colony was to see such emigrants as Henry Culp and Daniel Funk pass on through the settlement to take up a claim in Logan county, Ohio, in 1831 and 1832, or later in Allen and finally in Indiana.

Another factor in leading later settlers to disregard Fairfield county was the difference in the price of land. The price of the lands of the Ohio company in which Fairfield was located was set at two dollars per acre while the lands set aside in western Ohio by that state for the building of canals, and hence called "canal lands," sold for one dollar and twenty-five cents an acre. In the days when hundreds of settlers came west with less than fifty dollars and there was practically no money on the frontier, even this small difference in the price of land was a determining factor in choosing a location.

Strange as it may seem, one of the improvements that did more than anything else in the first half-century of Fairfield county's history to raise its economic prosperity, appears to have been one of the chief reasons for the breaking up of the Mennonite colony in Fairfield and Perry and for the transplanting of entire congregations to Allen county, Ohio. This was the digging of canals in the southeastern part of the state.

On July 4, 1825, the Ohio canal was opened near Newark in Licking county, adjoining Fairfield on the north. Men from Fairfield and surrounding counties flocked to the works eager to labor for the eight dollars a month paid by the state. A month was to consist of twenty-six "dry days" from sunrise to sunset. Although this canal ran through the northern part of Fairfield county it did not reach Lancaster. In a few years a spur called the "Side Cut" reached Lancaster from Carroll, and the year 1840 saw this section of the canal extended southward so that traffic was open by water route to the Ohio river. Wheat rose from twenty-five cents a bushel to a dollar, and other grains in proportion. Even potatoes, a crop which had no market value before the opening of the canal now brought forty cents a bushel at Circleville. Many farmers and business men suddenly became wealthy.

But the Mennonite colony and their neighbors in the hilly portions of the eastern side of the county were not in a position to profit from the new order so much as they wished. As was the case in many of the older settlements where Mennonites and Dunkards were among the first settlers, these had selected the more desirable lands with great care. They chose the hills, especially those sloping eastward, so that the early morning sun might dry the fields, warm the soil, and hasten the maturity of the growing crops. These drier soils were favorable, too, to the scientific methods of agriculture, growth of legumes, and rotation of crops that they had brought with them from southern Germany. As the settlement grew and these quiet, thrifty, industrious people prospered, they gradually acquired from some of their less fortunate neighbors most of the better farm locations. This had occurred in Fairfield and Perry counties. But with the coming of the canal and the drying up of the lowlands, now more fertile and more easily farmed than the hills, both Mennonites and Dunkards saw themselves less favorably situated both for the growing of crops and for marketing them economically. On one occasion while Daniel Brenneman was repairing fence on a steep hillside on his farm, a neighbor happening along remarked that he did not be-

lieve God intended this land for farming. It did very well as a home for deer and wild turkeys, he said, but it was hardly suitable for human habitation.

Small wonder then, that even before the canals were completed, Fairfield county Mennonites were lending a willing ear to the land-agent's story of vast unclaimed level regions in western Ohio where the government had set aside "canal lands" in the great "Black Swamp." Here canals were sure to multiply, the land was of undoubted fertility, and here was a section that in a few years would outrival Lancaster itself. All that was necessary was that the new settler should be first on the ground! The few remaining Indians had sold this last great reservation to the state in 1817 and were now preparing to accept transportation to their new trans-Mississippi possessions. In 1829 the Delawares and Chippewas were already gone and in 1831 the Senecas.

In the latter year the first Fairfield county settlers were prospecting on horseback and on foot through the dense Allen county woods trying to select a suitable spot for a future home in the new land of promise. John Stemen, son of Deacon Peter Stemen, seems to have gone north through Wapakoneta on his prospecting trip. Since there was not even a tavern at that place, he was obliged to lodge and eat with the Indians. On August 8, 1831, he purchased at one twenty-five per acre the northwest portion of the southeast quarter of section six, township three south and range six east—fifty-four and fifty-five one-hundredths' acres for sixty-nine dollars and nineteen cents—located one mile west and one-half mile south of the present site of Salem church. He was one of the first, if not the first, to settle in Sugar Creek township as well as in Allen county. From Roundhead to Elida he was obliged to cut a path for his team and wagon. His wife, Nancy Stukey, daughter of a German Reformed minister in Fairfield county, died in 1836, leaving him with five little children, the oldest of whom was ten. The nearest mill was at Sidney, Ohio, and the trip there and back required five days, provided it was not necessary to await one's turn too long. John Stemen helped to build at Elida the first schoolhouse in the western part of the county.

Stemen's former Fairfield county neighbor, Henry Huffer, purchased forty acres a mile east of John in 1833. Christian Stemen, uncle of John Stemen, came in 1834 and in 1837 acquired two tracts adjoining John on the north. His wife was Margaret Moyer.

Prices of land were already rising. Christian Stemen paid nearly three dollars per acre for his one hundred fifty-eight acres. In 1836 John Conrad had acquired eighty acres one-fourth mile east of Christian Stemen's purchase. Peter Stemen, father of the above John and Christian Stemen and a deacon in the Fairfield county Mennonite church, came in 1837 at the age of sixty-six and purchased a quarter section three miles west and one mile south of Salem church for one thousand dollars cash. Two years later his son, Peter Stemen, Jr., purchased the quarter section adjoining Salem church on the southwest for fifteen hundred and fifty dollars cash. Two years earlier this tract had sold for three hundred dollars. Two years later still, in 1841, Peter Stemen's aged father, Christian Stehmann, came with Peter's brother, Bishop Henry Stemen, two of the bishop's sons-in-law, Samuel and Henry Sherrick, Deacon John Sherrick, David Campbell, John Burkholder, and Joseph Lamen (Lehmann). These men, except Joseph Lamen who died single, all brought their families and at once organized a congregation. The fact that Bishop Henry Stemen paid sixteen hundred dollars cash for eighty acres one-half mile north of Salem church indicates that the new arrivals had money to spend for improved land and probably also that the holders of property in this community were ready to take advantage of the desire of these Mennonites to settle in a body. Deacon John Sherrick's one hundred sixty acres one mile north and two and one-half miles west of the church cost eight hundred fifty dollars. Most of the other new arrivals settled on land of their own within a radius of a few miles of the first comers. They did not erect a meetinghouse until 1847, when a log structure was built across the road from the present Salem church.

But the Fairfield Mennonite settlement was to continue to feel this serious drain on her population. The congregation was divided to some extent over the language issue. A strong conservative group still preferred German, but the majority were asking for English preaching and more modern methods. A related problem that was causing no little difficulty in the church was the changing economic situation. The canal had brought wealth into the county and a great increase in population. The simplicity and isolation of the log-cabin era were no longer possible, and vague dissatisfaction with the new order caused much uneasiness that was more easily sensed than explained or understood.

Then again, as indicated before, the Ohio canal advanced land values to a high peak in Fairfield county. Why not leave conditions

that were no longer favorable to the development of the old-time Mennonite order now that improved farms in Fairfield could be sold at unheard-of prices and equally good or better unimproved land could be purchased among the primeval solitudes of Allen county? Or the young Mennonite asked, Why spend a life-time in earning the price of a farm in Fairfield when the savings of a few years would purchase a forty- or an eighty-acre farm in Allen, Putnam, or Van Wert counties near the settlement established by the Stemens from 1831 to 1841?

Another factor in the movement of Mennonite population in Fairfield county was a realization that much of the land occupied by them in eastern Fairfield county and in Perry and Hocking counties, lying as it does at the edge of the Hocking valley mineral region, was unsuited to their favorite occupation—agriculture. The few Mennonites in this colony who were not farmers were millers, carpenters, or blacksmiths. Bishop John M. Brenneman's father, Henry, was a flour miller. He owned a farm and a flour mill down on Rush creek about one and one-half miles south of the Brenneman homestead on Pleasant Hill. His sons, John M. and George, learned the trade and operated the mill twenty-four hours per day after the canal was built. Each brother worked a continuous twelve-hour shift. Their "Superfine" brand of flour was in great demand. It was wheeled up and down the long steep hills twelve miles to Lancaster to be shipped to market on the canal. Bishop George Brenneman for many years operated a flour mill at Delphos, Ohio, on the western Ohio canal after he moved to Putnam county. Preacher Christian Culp, because he had a club foot that interfered with moving about on plowed ground and with doing other farm work, became a blacksmith and practiced this trade both before and after he moved to Allen county. Some of the wealthier Mennonites in Perry and Fairfield seem to have sold their lands unsuited to agriculture and purchased the higher priced farms nearer the Ohio canal in the vicinity of Canal Winchester in Franklin county about ten miles southwest of Columbus and about twenty-five northwest of the Fairfield-Perry settlement. Here a Mennonite colony flourished for over half a century. A congregation was organized here about the same time that the Mennonite church was established in Sugar Creek township, Allen county.

The next wholesale removal from Fairfield to Allen followed in 1852 when Preacher Christian Culp and a band of his friends settled in Allen and Putnam counties. He was very conservative and remained so during all the years of his active service. He

opposed all the "new things" that were being introduced into church work during the fifties and sixties, and never wholly favored the holding of Sunday schools in a church building, even after Sunday school had been organized in Allen county in 1868. The next year, 1853, Preacher George Brenneman came and with him several families of friends and relatives. He was ordained bishop a short time after his arrival. Bishop Henry Stemen was already seventy-eight years old and one of the very few bishops in all western Ohio. In the same year that Brenneman was ordained bishop, Bishop Daniel Funk of Logan county moved to Owen county, Indiana. Besides, Bishop Shank of Blanchard in Putnam county lacked many of the qualifications of an able, aggressive leader. Two years after George Brenneman left Fairfield for Elida, his oldest brother, Bishop John M. Brenneman, whom Bishop Henry Stemen had ordained to the oversight of the Franklin county congregation, moved to Allen and purchased one hundred and seventy-six acres one and one-half miles east of Salem church. A number of Franklin and Fairfield families including his uncle, Deacon Christian D. Beery, who approved of his conservative but strong and aggressive leadership, accompanied him and his family. After John M. Brenneman moved to Allen, Bishop Stemen formally installed him as bishop of the congregation in place of John M.'s younger brother George.

In spite of the number who had left, a fine group of active workers still remained to carry on the work in Fairfield. The group continued to prosper, and, if they could have had a resident bishop, the history of the congregation might have been different. Apparently, after the most conservative and capable leaders had moved away, no one arose who enjoyed the confidence of the bishops of the conference. Moreover, with a few notable exceptions, the deacons and ministers ordained in Franklin and Fairfield to fill the vacancies caused by the emigrations noted above, seem to have been selected for their conservatism rather than for any outstanding qualifications as pastors, teachers, or preachers. At an early date, probably to replace a still earlier log-cabin church, the congregation had erected a meetinghouse on Pleasant Hill on the old Henry Brenneman homestead southeast of Bremen. This was called the Bremen, or Pleasant Hill, meetinghouse. Later this church was moved across the road just north of the present Pleasant Hill cemetery. Roads were impassable during many months of the year. Frequently no services were held for three months at a time. Hence in 1858 a tiny church, twenty-six by twenty-four, was built

on Turkey Run in Perry county. The donor of the land, Joseph Beery, signs his name in German, "Joseph Biri," but his wife, Magdalene Beery, signs in English. There is some evidence that the Perry county group was more conservative than the Pleasant Hill people. There is no proof, however, that the building of the new church on Turkey Run indicated a division of the congregation. More probably it meant that the increased wealth of the congregation enabled them to provide two meetinghouses so that by holding meetings in each on alternate Sundays more people could attend services regularly.

For the next few years the settlement prospered, but the progressive policies of the young minister, Daniel Brenneman, wide-awake, and alive to the advantages of English preaching and of Sunday school work as he was, made it difficult for him to be true to his convictions and at the same time to coöperate with the more conservative members of his group. The greatest trial for both Mennonites and Dunkards, however, was to come in 1861 with the outbreak of the Civil War. Fairfield county descendants of Scotch-Irish Presbyterians and Baptists rushed into the conflict as their ancestors had entered the Revolution. The city of Lancaster had one company on its way to the seat of war within twenty-four hours after the President's call for 75,000 volunteers on April 15, 1861. During the following month four more companies volunteered and before September 20 Fairfield county had sent seventeen full companies of volunteers, all for three years service. Naturally, at such a time, nonresistant communities suffered many indignities. Later, when the bond issues were floated, Fairfield county Mennonites differed among themselves concerning the attitude consistent with their faith. Later, when drafted, they were divided too on the question of hiring substitutes or of paying the three hundred dollar fine or exemption fee. To the coercion and indignity without, were added misunderstanding and bitterness within the church. A few, unable to stand, yielded and enlisted. A large number moved to Allen, Putnam, and Van Wert counties near the Mennonite colony there.

Nine years after the great exodus of 1855, therefore, when John F. Funk, of Elkhart, visited Fairfield county, the congregation was still meeting in the two meetinghouses on alternate Sundays, but most of the preaching was being done in English by the youthful, but eminently able pastor, Daniel Brenneman. When Daniel Brenneman had been ordained to the ministry, only two brethren received votes, Daniel Brenneman and Aaron Good. The

congregation accepted the suggestion that both should be ordained. Later Good united with the Winebrennerians (Church of God) and Brenneman founded the Mennonite Brethren in Christ. Then a certain brother stated that he had learned a lesson and would never again vote to dispense with the lot in choosing a minister. This brother, Jacob Good, brother-in-law of Bishop John M. Brenneman and Preacher Christian Culp, was later ordained deacon in Allen county.

Funk, who had just begun the publication of the *Herald of Truth* and was interested in gathering about him talented young men of the church, persuaded Michael Keagy, a fine young German scholar and brother-in-law of Daniel Brenneman, to move to Chicago to become a writer and translator for the new publishing firm. A short time later, March, 1864, Preacher Daniel Brenneman himself moved to Elkhart county, Indiana.

Brenneman's removal seems to have deprived the organization of all its leaders except Preacher David H. Landis, a Rockingham county, Virginia, refugee. The next year (1865), when it became evident that conditions had become sufficiently settled in Virginia so that Preacher Landis soon would return to his home near Harrisonburg, Virginia, Bishop George Brenneman was called to Fairfield in June to conduct an ordination service at the Turkey Run church in Perry county. The lots for minister fell upon Noah Brenneman and Christian C. Beery and for deacon on Henry B. Brenneman, brother of Bishops John M. and George, and of Preacher Daniel Brenneman. These three newly elected candidates were ordained at Turkey Run meetinghouse in Perry county on June 5. Bishop Brenneman held services in Franklin county also, at Jacob Bowman's church, near Canal Winchester, but only a small group of worshippers was present.

In October, 1865, when Bishop John M. Brenneman visited Fairfield and Franklin county Mennonites to hold the autumn communion service, he learned that there was considerable dissatisfaction. Both the Franklin county Mennonites and Fairfield county Amish wished English preaching. Preacher David Landis had returned to his Virginia home in September.

Deacon Henry B. Brenneman moved to Elkhart, Indiana, a few years after his ordination to assist in John F. Funk's publication work. "Brother Henry," as he was called, was very active in Sunday school work for many years. Preacher C. C. Beery also left the Turkey Run church not long after his ordination to reside in a growing Mennonite community in Kent county, Michigan.

Preacher Noah Brenneman seems to have moved to Franklin county. He was not a good public speaker and preached very little. For some reason that is now not quite clear, all of these progressive leaders and workers moved away from Turkey Run.

During the years that followed, the congregation suffered some severe trials. Visiting ministers lent what help they could, but the congregation was not particularly fortunate in the men they raised to the ministry. Most of them were very conservative, some were not very fluent, and some could not preach English except with the greatest difficulty. Sunday school was not considered.

John F. Funk of Elkhart paid the congregation a visit in 1879. The aged deacon, Nicholas Stemen, had died the year before. Funk preached a number of sermons in various churches, spending ten days in the community. He held services in the Marion Dunkard church in Hocking county, at Turkey Run, at Pleasant Hill, and in the Amish settlement west of Bremen. The Perry-Fairfield congregation at that time had dwindled to forty or fifty members. Benjamin Hoover (or Huber), the only minister, could not preach English, and by that time the congregation strongly desired visits from English-speaking ministers. Interest was so great during Funk's visit that the church buildings were filled to capacity. One night the crowd at Turkey Run was so great that the floor of the building gave way and sank to the ground below. Fortunately there was no basement under the building, and the service continued without serious interruption.

Funk visited the Franklin county congregation, also. Here a small group under the leadership of Jacob Bowman, David Martin, and Noah Brenneman met every alternate Sunday. As in Fairfield, Sunday school and all other young people's activities were strictly prohibited and their introduction vigorously opposed. In this section of Ohio as well as in many other parts of the country the Sunday school cause had suffered through the misguided zeal of a few tactless leaders in other denominations through whose activities the term Sunday school had become associated with Sunday school picnics and other exercises that brought the Sunday school itself into disrepute. Mennonites were by no means the only religious group who opposed the institution on account of its connection with "worldly festivals" and "pagan celebrations in the woods."

In 1886 a visitor to the Franklin and Fairfield county Mennonite churches deplores that "In Fairfield they have houses of

worship, but few members attended services. In Franklin county there is a house of worship, but not so many members as we would like to see. Many of the young people go to other churches, and so the Mennonite church seems to be decreasing."

In the fall of 1887 when Bishop John M. Greider of Green county visited the settlement to conduct communion services in Franklin county, he ordained Nicholas Stemen deacon (November 14). He was a son of the aged Deacon Nicholas Stemen of Turkey Run who died in 1878.

During the next few years Allen county ministers of the second and third generation from the Fairfield emigrants to Allen made a strong attempt to save the mother colony from dissolution. In November, 1888, Preacher Moses Brenneman, born on Pleasant Hill in Fairfield nine years before his father, Bishop John M. Brenneman, moved to Allen, spent several days among the friends of his boyhood. But at the Pleasant Hill meetinghouse he found that "the once large and flourishing church has declined until only twelve members are left." Sad at heart, he went to Turkey Run and filled three appointments there. In Franklin county he filled two appointments at Martin's meetinghouse where twenty or twenty-five members met for services. He asks: "In many places she [the church] is declining, and what is the cause of this? Is it not because our dear young people are forsaking the faith of their parents, and are uniting with other churches?" And he adds that "many of our dear Mennonite parents are to-day lamenting because of this."

Later in the same year the young Allen county bishop, John M. Shenk, recently ordained to take the place of his uncles, John M. and George Brenneman, conducted preparatory and communion services at David Martins at Canal Winchester. At that time Preacher Noah Brenneman and Deacon Nicholas Stemen lived near Pickerington in Fairfield, near the Franklin county line. Bishop Shenk held a number of services at various places: Methodist church in Pickerington, Turkey Run and Pleasant Hill in Perry and Fairfield, and in Hocking county at the home of the River Brethren people, Preacher Jacob Good and wife, at their earnest request. In the late eighties and early nineties through emigration and the loss of their people to other churches, both Mennonite and Dunkard churches in Fairfield were in a state of serious decline. Both ministers and laity were greatly discouraged.

The Franklin county Mennonite community enjoyed a temporary revival early in the nineties when Benomi Stemen, wealthy farmer and successful raiser of Galloway cattle, settled his children

on farms around him and erected a neat little church on his premises for a family meetinghouse. But this, too, fell into disuse, and some years later the church was sold and the benches removed to Turkey Run church. In 1891 an effort was made to organize a Sunday school in Stemen's church but no one seemed qualified to conduct it and the young people preferred to attend the Methodist church in Pickerington where some of their number had already united with the church.

At Turkey Run, meanwhile, interest steadily declined in spite of the heroic efforts of the aged resident German minister, Benjamin Huber, of C. B. Brenneman of Allen county, and of J. J. Warye and Christian Byler of the Champaign-Logan community near West Liberty. When Benjamin Huber died in 1906 and Preacher B. B. Stoltzfus of West Liberty was placed in charge of the congregation only eight members remained. His untiring efforts stemmed the decline and doubled the membership during the period of his ministry, but in 1909 for the sake of his children he deemed it best to return to West Liberty. Since that time under the consecrated pastorate of Preacher Jacob Good, Preacher Benjamin Huber's son-in-law, who moved from Allen to Perry in 1910, the congregation had doubled in membership by 1928. Recent reports from Perry county, however, are very discouraging, and the future prospects of the little congregation are not bright.

Several years ago the old Pleasant Hill meetinghouse, where John M. Brenneman, George Brenneman, and Daniel Brenneman were ordained preachers, and Henry Brenneman, deacon, was sold and the proceeds used to build a woven wire fence around the cemetery. Since many of the former members have removed their dead to other burying grounds, even this city of Pleasant Hill's departed dead is fallen into ruin with a few fine red-granite tombstones still hidden among the tangled blackberry briars and a growth of twenty-foot locust saplings so thick that one must force his way through the dense undergrowth to within a few feet of the graves before he becomes aware of the stones placed there to mark them. The Turkey Run cemetery is well kept. Here gravestones mark the last resting place of Mennonite pioneers who died more than a century ago. In former days it was the custom in Fairfield county to maintain family burying grounds. At present many a commanding hilltop in Fairfield and Perry counties has among the fields a fenced-in rectangle where lie the earthly remains of many who once occupied a prominent position in this Mennonite community. One and one-half miles east of the Pleasant Hill cemetery

is the Sugar Hill cemetery where lie buried Barbara (Beery) Brenneman and her son, Abraham, both of whom died of small pox in 1838. She was the mother of the Brenneman brothers, John M., George, Henry, and Daniel.

Some miles west of Bremen, near Colfax, far back from the road and at the top of a high steep hill, is the old Kurtz burying ground where some of the Amish settlers lie buried. It is now endowed and cared for by the Mennonite descendants of Amish who moved to Topeka, Indiana, from this county more than half a century ago.

Even the names of many of these early Fairfield county Mennonite settlers have disappeared from the county. Other Mennonite names are found no longer except as they appear on the membership rolls of the Evangelical, United Brethren, and Methodist churches in the vicinity of Bremen, North Berne, and Lancaster. The active membership of some of these churches is composed of the descendants of Mennonite settlers. Were it not for his knowledge of the prosperity and growth of the settlements that Mennonite emigrants from this community established in Allen county, Ohio, and in other places, and of the valuable contribution that they and their descendants have made and are making to Mennonite thought and life, the Mennonite historian's visit to Fairfield county would be an experience of unmixed melancholy.

THE ANABAPTISTS IN ENGLAND DURING THE COMMONWEALTH, 1648-1654

C. Eden Quainton

To some minds the New Jerusalem may be nothing but the hopeless dream of visionary fanatics, impossible of achievement and fated never to come into being. Yet the attempt has been made, and among those who believed ardently in the possibility of setting up a visible kingdom of the Saints on earth must be numbered certain Anabaptists. At Münster during 1534-1535 under the leadership of Jan Bockelson of Leyden the most famous of all Anabaptist communities set up the new Israel and inaugurated the reign of the Saints. But failure and tragedy awaited them. The bishop of Münster, swept out by the rising tide of Anabaptism, was eagerly looking for an opportunity to recover his lost see and stamp out for ever the last remnants of that heresy within his territories. The town was besieged, and on June 25, 1535, passed once more into the hands of its feudal overlord, the Prince-Bishop Franz von Waldeck. Vengeance, so appalling that it is almost incredible, was immediately taken upon the Anabaptists. Indiscriminate murder and innumerable executions were the order of the day until all traces of the revolutionary regime were obliterated.[1] Not all Anabaptists went to such extremes as Jan of Leyden; in fact the reverse is the case. But the memory of the excesses at Münster lingered on, and future Anabaptists found it hard to shake off the discredit which had become attached generally to their sect. Usually they were quiet, humble, respectable folk, the left wing of Protestantism. Their eager hope was to be allowed to live the simple Christian life, as they understood it. Most of them were probably small traders, handicraftsmen, journeymen, or peasants. In its social context, therefore, Anabaptism represents a movement on the part of the poor in town and country.[2] Their political ideal, however, was a theocracy, and many regarded themselves as independent of all civil authority, which could neither compel them to take an oath, nor go to law, nor engage in warfare. Inevitably such doctrines brought conflict with the

[1] Bax, E. Belfort, *Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists,* 172-331.

[2] *Ibid., passim.* See also Langenwalter, J. H., *Christ's Headship of the Church,* 24-41.

secular arm. The rising power of princely absolutism could hardly make its peace with these theocratic idealists. Argument was futile, and no other course seemed open save persecution of those whose view of the Apostolic dictum that "the powers that be are ordained of God" differed from that of bishops, princes, and magistrates.

The type of Anabaptism that took root in England was far removed from the fanatical form that suffered tragedy at Münster. The anarchical and communistic elements that have loomed so large in the conventional accounts of the movement were not transplanted to England. The source of English Anabaptism is not so much Jan of Leyden as Menno Simons, who held to the usual Anabaptist doctrine of Antipaedobaptism, but repudiated the excesses, both in doctrine and practice, of the Münsterites.[3] There is no doubt that Anabaptist refugees from the Netherlands fled to England in the sixteenth century,[4] but their influx seems to have been spasmodic. Nor is it surprising that they were exposed to constant suspicion on the part of the government, as was so often the case on the continent. From the point of view of the state, to say nothing of ecclesiastical authority, they were a dubious acquisition and were probably tarred with the same brush as the extremists at Münster. As their reputation was, so would their conduct be. Consequently intermittent persecution was their lot;[5] it could hardly have been otherwise. Prejudice against them was too deep-seated to be easily overthrown, and in any case toleration was not to the liking of the sixteenth century. But they were not exterminated, and through all the *sturm und drang* of Marian reaction and Elizabethan persecution little knots of pious folk cherished the faith that alone could move mountains and lead them to the gates of the City of God.

Little is heard of the Anabaptists during the early years of the seventeenth century, but their numbers must have grown steadily since at the time of the Civil War, when the variety of sectarianism was apparently infinite, they were regarded as one of the most numerous sects. Even the mighty Archbishop Laud had had to confess that he could not root them out of his own diocese, to say nothing of the kingdom at large.[6] It is clear, however, that

---

3 Gooch, G. P., *English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century*, 63, 64.

4 Strype, John, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, I, 99.

5 *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, 1540-1541, XVI, 271.

6 Gardiner, S. R., *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War*, 1603-1642, IX, 81.

when the Civil War broke out the term Anabaptist had become a label fastened indiscriminately on a great variety of people who held an equally great variety of dogmas both theological and political. Anabaptism though still part of the vocabulary of abuse, had become a generic term and was used to describe with a lofty impartiality such groups as Independents in general, Quakers, Millenarians, Antinomians, Fifth Monarchy Men, and even Presbyterians.[7] Some of these sects plainly are entitled to share in the name of Anabaptist, though the term is meaningless as applied to the Presbyterians. Any sect, however, that professed chiliastic views was almost certain to be styled Anabaptist, recalling at once to the minds of the hostile the millennial aspirations of Jan of Leyden. In this connection the Fifth Monarchy Men soon had the pre-eminence. By 1653 they were probably the noisiest of all the sects, Anabaptist or otherwise, and for a time, so great was their influence, were almost in a position to dictate the government's policy.[8] At such a moment it is obvious that their importance had vastly increased. Mere theological speculation is one thing; but it is an entirely different state of affairs when theory is about to be translated into practice and prophecy become fact. The bases of the Fifth Monarchy Men's eschatology were the apocalyptic books in the Bible, especially the Book of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John the Divine. To these seventeenth century enthusiasts, who at their best were fired by ideals of real dignity and loftiness, there was nothing obscure about such writings. The prophecies in Daniel plainly foretold the immediate coming of God's everlasting kingdom, the successor to the four great monarchies of the past—the Assyrian, Persian, Greek, and Roman. Soon the Fifth Monarchy would be ushered in, and Christ, the King, would reign forever. The Rule of the Saints, therefore, was imminent and it was the task of the Fifth Monarchy Man to bend his energy to bring it about.[9]

The smouldering embers of political and religious discontent burst into flame when the Civil War began. Conflicting ideals of toleration, monarchy, and the authority of Parliament sought victory through the sword. In the ensuing struggle the army emerged as the dominating force in England, and at the head of that army

---

[7] Brown, L. F., *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum*, preface. See also Gooch, *English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century*, 109, 110, 226-228.

[8] *Thurloe Papers*, I, 395, 396, 501.

[9] Brown, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum*, 12, 13.

stood Oliver Cromwell. When the war was at last brought to an end his personality eclipsed all others. Charles Stuart had been executed, England was no longer a monarchy, and Cromwell's ascendancy over the army and over Parliament was the dominant fact. At the same time the country was honeycombed by religious factions, each striving to push its way to the top. What was needed in the sphere of religion was toleration, freedom of conscience, which at first some of the sects were not willing to admit. The Anabaptists, however, did in general advocate toleration, though at times it was more observed in theory than in practice. Nevertheless in an age when freedom of conscience was still a far-off ideal they championed it and took part in the Civil War with that end in view. They were very strong in the army and regarded the battles they fought as blows struck in the service of the Lord, and when Fifth Monarchy opinions were added to their former doctrines their faith in the holiness of their cause was redoubled.[10]

At the moment when the Commonwealth was established in 1649 the Anabaptist party had not yet reached the zenith of its power, although Harrison, the center of Anabaptist influence in the army, was even at that date an intimate associate of Cromwell. In fact only a few days after Pride's Purge in December, 1648, Harrison was to be found urging that Cromwell consider seriously the typical Anabaptist doctrine "whether the Magistrate hath any inspection at all in matters of religion."[11] Harrison's influence, and as a corollary the influence of his party, steadily grew. When Cromwell was absent in Scotland during the summer of 1650, Harrison was virtually his lieutenant in England "watching over the common safetie" as a "faithful servant and substitute."[12] The rise of Harrison, therefore, continued,[13] until it reached its climax in 1653,[14] the collapse coming suddenly when Cromwell assumed the title of Lord Protector.[15] Gradually the position of Harrison and his followers was strengthened, both in the army and in the Council of State, in whose hands administrative power rested,

---

10 *Ibid.*, 9-11.

11 *Clarke Papers* (Camden Society Publications), II, 100.

12 *Original Letters, Illustrative of English History,* edited by Henry Ellis, 2nd series, III, 357.

13 *Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow, Lieutenant-General of the Horse in the Commonwealth of England,* 1625-1672. Edited by C. H. Firth, I, 345.

14 *English Historical Review* (1893), 530.

15 *Thurloe Papers,* I, 641. See also *Calendar of State Papers* (Domestic), 1653-1654, 371.

LIBRARY
CALIFORNIA BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Seminary Knoll
Covina, California

while legislation and extraordinary justice still remained the function of the Rump. The growing desire of the fanatics and military leaders was to dissolve the Rump; the desire of the Rump was to perpetuate its existence and curb the fanatics; the desire of the country at large was to see the dissolution of the Rump. Conflict between the army, which wanted democracy, and the Parliament, which stood in the way, had become acute by the opening of 1653, and eventually brought destruction to Cromwell's hope of a peaceful union between the army and the civil government.[16]

It is clear that in the early months of 1653 the military chiefs were showing signs of restlessness and dissatisfaction with the Rump. Frequent meetings were held at which sometimes Cromwell was present and sometimes was not. Such questions as the future of parliament, its character, the administration of justice, the appointment of "Godly able persons" to the fleet were the themes of their debates.[17] The crucial issue of course was the problem of parliament. On March 2, Cromwell and all the Major-Generals met to consider what was to be done about a new parliament, but the only apparent result of their deliberations was the appointment of a committee of officers to advise about this question.[18] The Major-Generals wanted the dissolution of the Rump, but Cromwell was undecided and probably reluctant, although by April 19 there were signs of their reaching an agreement.[19] Feeling was by this time running high and bitter words were being exchanged in parliament,[20] while in the city of London the Anabaptist preachers were vehemently supporting the aims of their fellow sectarians in the army. Loudly they clamoured at Blackfriars church for a new parliament and, if necessary, a new General, unless Cromwell should see the error of his ways.[21]

The pressure of Harrison and his followers was decisive. Cromwell in effect bowed to the storm and agreed to dissolve the Rump. On April 20, 1653, he marched with a body of troops behind him to Westminster and dismissed the most famous Parliament that England had ever seen. The April revolution, for such

---

16 Trevelyan, G. M., *England under the Stuarts*, 304, 305.

17 *English Historical Review* (1893), 527. (Extracts from Newsletters among the Clarke Papers). The officers informed the committee of the Admiralty and Navy that if godly and able persons were wanted the army could supply them.

18 *Ibid.*, 527, 528.

19 *Idem.*

20 *Calendar of State Papers* (Venetian), XXIX. 60.

21 *English Historical Review* (1893), 528. (Extracts from Newsletters among the Clarendon Papers).

it was, marks the first great triumph of Harrison and his Anabaptist supporters.[22] The way now lay open for the election of an assembly of godly men. The Rule of the Saints would soon be established, and, as Vavasor Powell, "that forloorn dragoon," an energetic Fifth Monarchy Anabaptist, declared, "law should streame downe like a river freely, as for 20 s. what formerly cost 20 l., impartially as the saints please, and it should runn as rivers doe, close to the doors."[23] At the moment, therefore, Cromwell's cutting of the gordian knot was received with general acclaim. Even from a county as far from the centre of things as Hereford congratulations poured in, not unmixed, however, with excessive praise and extravagant hopes. "Let the high praises of God be in our mouths, and the Generations to come tell of his wonders. Let the improvement of this opportunity be your care and our prayers, that you may follow the Lambe whithersoever he goeth."[24]

Cromwell's reply to his sudden popularity among the sects was to disappoint them. It seems that while he would go some of the way with the Harrisonian faction he would not go all the way. Their demand for a democratically elected parliament of the saints was partially refused and they had to be content with a compromise which took the form of a "nominated" Parliament, the members being selected from the sectarian congregations, partly by the officers of the army, partly by the congregations themselves. This Parliament is known variously as Barebones Parliament, the Little Parliament, or the Nominated Parliament. The soldiers were not altogether satisfied with this experiment since they felt that a greater share in the selection of members ought to have been granted to them. It was even rumored that Harrison had resigned his commission.[25] Such, however, was not the case, for he was soon appointed a member of the Council of State.[26]

Whatever else may be said about the Little Parliament, it cannot be charged with a scarcity of ideas or enthusiasm. The members were anything but Laodicean. In fact some of their legislation was centuries ahead of their age. This is clearly exemplified in their act for the regulation of marriage. In this advanced piece of legislation it was laid down, amongst other things, that

---

22 *Ibid.*, 526-530. See also *Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow*, I, 350; *Nicholas Papers* (Camden Society Publications), II, 13.

23 *English Historical Review* (1893), 533.

24 *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, edited by Henry Ellis, 2nd series, III, 368, 369.

25 *Thurloe Papers* I, 306, 341.

26 *Ibid.*, 338, 339, 369. See also *Calendar of State Papers* (Venetian), XXIX, 101.

marriages must be solemnized before a justice of the peace and that no other marriages were legal. In a word they provided for civil marriage,[27] a striking illustration of the secular and anticlerical attitude of some of the sects, though it does not mean any diminution of their religious zeal. Among other things the proposal was brought forward that the court of Chancery be abolished, though it was not enacted into law. It represented, however, a desire on the part of Harrison and the Fifth Monarchy Anabaptists, in that they held it necessary to destroy the courts of law as a preliminary to the establishment of Christ's Kingdom.[28] Some of the legislation proposed in Barebones Parliament was clearly the product of the visionary idealism of the Harrisonian radicals. Nevertheless a body of solid achievement remained to the credit of the Little Parliament, which is more than can be said for its successor or for the Rump of the Long Parliament. The Anabaptists were never actually the majority of the House, but their meticulous care about regular attendance, together with their eager enthusiasm and burning zeal, gave them an ascendancy over their more moderate fellow members. The law courts, however, were not swept away, though reforms were made, nor was the Anabaptist wish to wipe out the old Church organization fulfilled.[29] But the foundations were laid for many subsequent reforms—in the army and navy, the public finances, registration of births and deaths, imprisonment for debt, lunacy, etc.[30] Millennial ideals may be one side of the Little Parliament's character, but the vision of the imminent rule of the saints did not obliterate all sense of hard reality.

The activity of Barebones Parliament was not confined solely to domestic affairs. In foreign policy its achievements were not extensive, but at least a treaty with Sweden was negotiated and friendly relations were established with the Protestant Cantons of Switzerland.[31] More important, however, than these matters was the problem of the Dutch War, which the Little Parliament had inherited. On the whole the balance of success lay with the English fleet, and negotiations had been opened for the establishment of peace. The United Provinces sent four commissioners, of whom the chief was Beverning, and at the beginning of August, 1653, the English Parliament in its turn appointed a committee, consisting

---

[27] *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum* 1642-1660, 715-718.
[28] Glass, H. A., *The Barebone Parliament*, 95-97.
[29] *Ibid.*, 87-115.
[30] *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum* 1642-1660, 703-813
[31] Glass, *The Barebone Parliament*, 93.

of Cromwell, Harrison, and Lambert, to treat with them.[32] There seems to be no doubt that these three constituted at the moment the real driving force in the government, as Beverning and his colleagues soon discovered. It follows, therefore, that the strong position of Harrison was of the first importance, since he was supported by the Anabaptists, whose power was now approaching its zenith and who were "men no ways inclined to an accommodation with the state of their high and mighty lordships" of the United Provinces.[33] In effect the point of view of the Anabaptists was that no peace ought to be made with the Dutch until they would accept a coalescence of the two republics, involving not only some form of political union but religious unity as well. Needless to say such an impossible demand never brought any material results. The Anabaptists might succeed in establishing the Rule of the Saints in England, but the Dutch were not willing to permit its forcible extension to the Netherlands. Thus one of the chief obstacles in the way of a peaceful settlement with the United Provinces proved to be the Anabaptists, and as long as Barebones Parliament continued to exist the negotiations remained fruitless.[34]

The bellicosity of the Anabaptists in 1653 is one of their most interesting characteristics. Normally their history is anything but a story of aggressiveness and political truculence. Drawing their members chiefly from the lower walks of life they were usually quiet, decent, humble folk. Their zeal for war does not come from Menno Simons, but is clearly attributable to the infiltration of Fifth Monarchy opinions. In fact it is precisely those Anabaptists who were also Fifth Monarchy men among whom warlike ardor raged the most furiously. This was the case both in the army and outside. In London furious propaganda was spread by the preachers who thundered forth from the pulpits against governments and against the United Netherlands.[35] Beverning, the Dutch Commissioner, himself heard them at Blackfriars and reported their anti-Dutch prayers and sermons to Holland. "Being then in the assembly of the saints," he wrote, "I heard one prayer and two sermons; but good God! what cruel, and abominable, and most horrid trumpets of fire, murther and flame!"[36] Beverning's description of the oratorical style of the preachers at Blackfriars

32 *Calendar of State Papers* (Venetian), XXIX, 108.
33 *Thurloe Papers,* I, 395, 396.
34 *Ibid.,* 410, 411.
35 *Ibid.,* 468, 501.
36 *Ibid.,* 442.

is not unfair, and it must have been plain to him that such vehement language was as embarrassing to Cromwell as it was to the Dutch Commissioners. Not all Anabaptists, of course, urged such extreme views as the Fifth Monarchy group, but it is true nevertheless that on certain things there was unanimity amongst all sections of the Anabaptist party. They agreed, for example, that there must be a reform of the laws of England and that the tithe must be abolished. In general, however, their greatest weakness was a complete inability to grasp the meaning of compromise, a fatal handicap which ultimately ruined the radicals in Barebones Parliament.[37]

As the summer of 1653 drew to a close there were signs of an imminent breach between Cromwell and the moderates on the one hand and the Harrisonian radicals on the other. The Little Parliament was not generally popular, and whatever odium resulted from its actions fell always on the head of Cromwell. In addition to this, the dour inflexibility of the Anabaptists, who obstructed or endeavored to obstruct anything which savoured of a compromise, and their determined opposition to the Dutch peace embarrassed Cromwell so much that a break with Harrison was virtually inevitable.[38] The latter was a member of the Council of State, at whose meetings he was naturally the chief protagonist of Anabaptist ideas, but it is not surprising that by the beginning of October his influence had begun to wane, to the satisfaction of those who were negotiating for an Anglo-Dutch peace.[39] At the same time the prestige of the Anabaptists as a whole was rapidly disappearing. They advocated a continuance of the Dutch war, the inescapable consequence of which was an increase in taxation and the dislocation of commerce, and it was beginning to dawn on the city of London that this was too high a price to pay even for the New Jerusalem. Soon the violent speech of the extremists brought disorder in the city. On October 26, 1653, there was a riot at St. Paul's, where Anabaptist preachers fulminated regularly. Some apprentices burst into the church and after insulting the preacher endeavored to eject his congregation. The Anabaptists, however, rallied round their preacher, and the conflict assumed such serious proportions that the troops had to be called in to put an end to the uproar. To prevent any recurrence of such scandalous scenes the

---

[37] Brown, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England during the Interregnum*, 40-43.

[38] *Idem.*

[39] *Thurloe Papers*, I, 519, 523.

Council of State and the civic authorities posted a guard and had the city well patrolled during the night by both horse and foot-soldiers.[40] So serious a view of this lawless outburst was taken by the Council of State that a committee of three, Montague, Bennet, and Broughton, was appointed to inquire into the whole affair, and such rioters as had been arrested were to be brought before the Lord Mayor.[41] The Fifth Monarchy men, however, were not silenced yet. Blackfriars was still the headquarters of their propaganda which with unfailing regularity they continued to preach on Monday nights. And it is easy to understand that their opponents resented being referred to as the "outworks of Babylon."[42] The chief of the Blackfriars preachers was a certain Christopher Feake, the boldest orator of them all, who never minced matters when haranguing his followers about the iniquities of Cromwell, "the man of sin, the old dragon."[43]

There were limits to Cromwell's patience and forbearance, and by December the breaking-point had been reached. Accordingly Barebones Parliament was summarily dismissed and the attempt to govern England by godly men was brought to an end. The Anabaptists, Harrison among them, had had their day. Cromwell, naturally enough, was more than ever anathema in their eyes, and, when he became Lord Protector by the Instrument of Government, their fury was well-nigh ungovernable. Christopher Feake and his colleague, Vavasor Powell, redoubled their efforts at Blackfriars and, like the heathen, raged furiously together.[44] These two sons of thunder, however, were not to remain unmolested for long. Cromwell's hands had been tremendously strengthened by the *coup d'etat* of December, 1653, and he was no longer willing to tolerate the violent criticism of the Fifth Monarchy Anabaptists. Powell and Feake were to be given no more rope and denunciation of the government was to be stopped. Steps were at once taken to arrest them and bring them before the Council of State, and in addition orders were issued to draw up a new bill for the restraint of treason and sedition.[45] Harrison also felt the heavy hand of the new government. He was asked whether he would support it or not, and replying in the negative promptly had his commission

---

40 *Calendar of State Papers* (Venetian), XXIX, 142.
41 *Calendar of State Papers* (Domestic), 1653-1654, 205.
42 Rymer's *Foedera,* XX, 719, 720. See also *Thurloe Papers,* I, 612.
43 *Thurloe Papers,* I, 621.
44 *Calendar of State Papers* (Domestic), 1653-1654, 304-308.
45 *Ibid.,* 308, 309.

taken away.[46] It remained only to decide the punishment to be meted out, and to deal with the authorities at Blackfriars who had permitted Feake and Powell to hold their meetings. The latter was easily done by appointing Major-General Skippon to inform the churchwardens of Blackfriars that the Monday evening lectures were to cease.[47] The question of punishment for Feake and Powell took more time and was decided a short time afterwards. Feake was imprisoned in Windsor Castle, together with another colleague, Simpson by name,[48] but Powell escaped to Wales where he continued to preach the gospel of the saints and lament the rise of the now all-powerful Cromwell.[49] As for Harrison, the Council of State commanded him to retire to Staffordshire and await further orders.[50]

The removal of the Anabaptist leaders did not immediately result in the abandonment of hostility on the part of their flock. It is no doubt true that their strength was really broken, but they were still numerous in the army, and officers were to be found inveighing as hard as they could against the evils of the day. A certain Captain John Williams was reported to be preaching in the county of Radnor,[51] and it must be remembered that Vavasor Powell was also in Wales. Meanwhile in London the arrest of Feake and Simpson had removed all the smoke and fire from Fifth Monarchy gatherings. Without those two ardent enthusiasts there was little excitement, and by February, 1654, Marchamount Needham, one of Cromwell's spies, was able to report to the Protector that he had been down to investigate and had found the once famous meeting a very dull business indeed.[52] In fact the center of Anabaptist activity seems to have been no longer in London, but rather in Wales and Ireland.[53] There is no doubt that their propaganda was being continued in Wales by Powell, John Williams, Morgan Lloyd, and others, all of whom urged the overthrow of the Protectorate and the destruction of tyranny. One of them was reported to have said that he would rather be ruled by Charles Stuart than by Cromwell, while John Williams called the Protector a tyrant

---

[46] *Thurloe Papers* I, 641, 642.
[47] *Calendar of State Papers* (Domestic), 1653-1654, 309.
[48] *Ibid.*, 371, 449; *Thurloe Papers,* II, 67.
[49] *Thurloe Papers,* II, 93.
[50] *Calendar of State Papers* (Domestic), 1653-1654, 386.
[51] *Thurloe Papers,* II, 46.
[52] *Calendar of State Papers* (Domestic), 1653-1654, 393.
[53] *Calendar of State Papers* (Venetian), XXIX, 185; *Thurloe Papers,* II, 93.

as great as Charles I.[54] Thus by word of mouth and with their pens they kept up the struggle, but it was a losing battle. Though Cromwell had patiently borne their indiscretions, which sprang largely from excess of zeal, the limit had now been reached, and in any case their policy failed entirely to commend itself any longer to the powerful commercial classes who were tired of the economic dislocation that followed from the Dutch War.

Now that Feake, Simpson, and Harrison were out of the way, and Powell was in Wales, the driving force of the movement was for the time being gone. There were still plots and rumors of plots in London, and a few people were arrested for complicity therein,[55] but Cromwell remained unshaken. Harrison, together with Carew, Courtney, and Colonel Rich, was imprisoned, after repeated summons to appear before the Protector. Not even a warrant moved them to come, whereupon Cromwell sent for them and had them brought before him. To his request for a reason why they had disobeyed, they replied that they could not and would not recognize a government which was contrary to the will of God, Babylonish, and anti-Christian, and that they "obeyed the Scripture, which calls to the daughter of Syon to come out of Babylon." It was finally proposed to them that they should retire to their respective counties on parole not to leave them, and that the government would then be satisfied. They refused, and were promptly committed to imprisonment.[56] It rested, therefore, with Vavasor Powell to keep the extremist propaganda going. He heartened his followers as best he could, urging them to persevere and not to be frightened by the proclamations of the government. His ubiquitousness was extraordinary, and the story went that he had killed three horses by hard riding. There was a good deal of secrecy, however, about his movements, so much so that the soldiers of the Protector were offering money for information about his meetings.[57] And in view of the fact that Powell constantly preached the destruction of the present regime it is not surprising that he endeavored to raise troops of his own persuasion, who, presumably, would be useful when the work of subversion should begin.[58]

On the whole the Saints were reasonably quiet during 1654, in spite of the efforts of Powell and his co-workers. The opposi-

54 *Ibid.*, 129.

55 *Calendar of State Papers* (Venetian), XXIX, 188, 189; *Calendar of State Papers* (Domestic), 1653-1654, 407, 418.

56 *Clarke Papers,* II, 242-246.

57 *Thurloe Papers,* II, 128.

58 *Ibid.*, 174.

tion of the extreme members, however, toward the Protectorate never wavered, while the imprisonment of Feake, Simpson, Harrison, and others shed a halo of sanctity around their heads. They were suffering for conscience' sake and their constant exhortation was that the whole body should remain true to its principles. They would never willingly accept the Protectorate, not because it was the creation of the army but because it was the rule of one man. Only Christ could rule them alone: monarchy, overt or veiled, was no longer the prerogative of man. That was the view of the Fifth Monarchy Man, though not perhaps of all shades of Anabaptist opinion. Further, the Anabaptists as a whole carried the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers to its logical conclusion, and, when Cromwell seemed to be moving further and further in the direction of an established church supported by tithes, they felt he was defying one of their most cherished beliefs. And it was largely due to this question of tithes, which to all Anabaptists were anathema, that Barebones Parliament came to grief. The radicals were agreed on the necessity of abolishing tithes, but Cromwell and his more moderate men withstood them and abolished the Rule of the Saints instead.

The attempt, therefore, to "build the New Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land" was a failure, not because the aim was ignoble and unworthy of achievement, but rather because it was a counsel of perfection. No people known to history have ever approached the perfect society. The wonder is, not that the Saints failed but that they kept their courage so firm and their faith so high, living ever in the hope of seeing Christ's Kingdom set up on earth. With evil, as they conceived it, they would never compromise; the service of both God and Mammon was to them unthinkable. Cromwell, for his part, respected the sincerity of these men, but his spirit was sorely tried by them, and to expect him to bear their abuse without hitting back would be to ask too much of mortal man. His understanding of the realities of this world, and of the distinction between the possible and the impossible had its effect: as long as he was alive he preserved England from the Stuarts. The Anabaptists, though they continued to work for their ideal state for some years afterwards, never reached their goal. Their legacy is the memory of high ideals, nobly conceived but doomed to failure in an unsympathetic and too practical world.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT THE MENNONITES IN AMERICA IN 1841: A CONTEMPORARY DOCUMENT BY JACOB KREHBIEL

Translated and Edited by Harold S. Bender

Introduction

Jacob Krehbiel, a Mennonite preacher of Primerhof in the Palatinate, left his home in the year 1831 to emigrate to America. He finally settled in western New York in Erie county, not far from Buffalo. Under date of December 20, 1831, he addressed a letter to his friends in the homeland describing his impressions of America. This letter was published in German as a little pamphlet at Speyer, Germany, in 1832 under the title,

> *Letter from America and a report about Conditions there by Jacob Krehbiel, a Mennonite preacher, formerly living at Primerhof in Rhenish Bavaria, for emigrants and non-emigrants.* Speyer 1832. Published by J. C. Kolb's Bookstore.

In this pamphlet Krehbiel gives some interesting data about the Mennonites in western New York and Canada. A few extracts may be of interest.

"Our community is located at the western end of New York state on Lake Erie. The clearing of this country was first begun about twenty or twenty-five years ago when trade began to develop because of the completion of the canal between Albany and Buffalo. The community is still in the making. One can still buy land cheaply here since the farm we had intended to buy near Lancaster, Pennsylvania, where an acre cost about 100 dollars, would have cost at least $4000, and as I hear the land here is just as good as there and could attain such a high value here also in ten or fifteen years. Our coreligionists who are living here all came from Pennsylvania just a few years ago. They sold their land at a high price and bought here cheaply. People are still coming here from that place. But there is still so much land to be had that several hundred families could settle here. Everything grows here just like you have at home although wheat and corn are the chief crops and wine grapes have not yet been tested out. Apples and peaches

do well and are also better than at home and produce good crops almost every year. I have not seen many peaches and prunes except in Upper Canada [now called Ontario. Ed.] from whence I brought along two young trees. You will wonder why I was in Canada. This is the reason: Our ministers meet annually from the congregations as we do at home. This year the meeting was held in Upper Canada on the 14th of October. Since I had sufficiently recovered from my sickness to go along on the sixty mile trip by wagon, and since they insisted upon my going and since I was anxious to see the land of the old Huron Indians, which I had read so much about at home without ever having thought that I would be able to see the country myself, I agreed to go along. On the trip we came to the great natural wonder of the new world, to the famous Niagara Falls which I had a good chance to see, for at my request we stopped and went to the base of the falls. Many people from far distant sections of America came here to see the falls and even from England. I must briefly describe the scene because of its remarkableness. [Krehbiel here describes the Niagara Falls at some length. His description is omitted. Ed.]

"In Canada we enjoyed the greatest hospitality. On Friday, October 14, the first meeting was held for ministers and bishops only. Then on Sunday the communion service was held and on Monday another meeting which was attended by a large number of people. A great spirit of unity was manifested among the congregations, which have good and capable speakers for preachers. Around the meetinghouse at a short distance along the side of the windows, posts are set up where the horses are tied, because the church house, although not far away from the dwellings, nevertheless stands by itself. I was well pleased with everything; in fact it exceeded my expectations by far. The place is called Twenty Mile Creek in Clinton township, Lincoln county, under the Royal English Government. [The place is now called Vineland. Ed.] There is much more fruit there than here in Clarence township and it is said that there is a good crop practically every year. I had not imagined that Canada would be such a good country and have such prosperity as I found. The taxes are almost less than in the United States and all the trades are free as in the United States of America. The land is very fertile, mostly level with a few hills and moderate-sized mountains.

"In this connection I must mention something else. When I was once along with one of the preachers of that place together with several friends, and dropped a few words on the subject of the

prosperity of the colony, he told me that these families had moved to Canada from Pennsylvania about twenty-five years earlier, very poor, and had bought some "bush" land from the English Government. But through sickness and other conditions they were unable to pay so that they could not retain possession of the land any longer. As they were in this sad condition, several coreligionists from Pennsylvania came into the community and learned of their condition. Thereupon they asked that some of them should return with them to Pennsylvania where they would secure by the help of some other friends the necessary money, without interest, to pay for their land until they would be able to pay it back again without a definite time set, but if this would prove impossible, they would not require re-payment. This very thing took place and these families, ten households in number, long ago re-paid the loan and are now most prosperous. Some families have from one hundred to one hundred and fifty or two hundred acres of land and much stock such as horses, oxen, cattle and swine. I was among them and saw all this myself. One of them said to me: 'Canada I usually call the poor man's country because the poor man, if he is industrious, has unequalled opportunities here to build up a fortune for his family and provide for his children.'

"I was once traveling with a bishop from Markham near York, [now Toronto] Canada, and asked about the conditions in his community which is eighty miles farther on. He told me that if we had not yet bought he would have liked to have us buy good land cheap in their neighborhood. He himself had moved there from Pennsylvania thirty years ago because he and his wife had only $100.00 and were unable to buy anything much in Pennsylvania. For that reason he had bought some land from the English Government to be paid for in ten years. Since that time he had bought more land so that at the present time he owned 600 acres which he had fully paid for and of which he had given his older children 400 acres and retained 200 acres. Such and similar cases are not at all rare throughout America and could also be cited from our own neighborhood. But for the most part it requires hard work and industry and a wise and provident administration. Otherwise one could come into quite the opposite situation. When I returned home I told all this to my family with the remark that if we had not bought we would probably move to Canada, but then our Johannes said at once, 'Even if it would be the best in Canada I would not go there to live because the government is a Royal government.' We laughed at this genuinely American expression and agreed with him."

On page 4 of the pamphlet Krehbiel tells how they came to settle in this community. They had come to Buffalo not knowing of the existence of a Mennonite church in the vicinity. Krehbiel describes their experiences as follows.

"We were all heartily tired of traveling and were anxious to put an end to it but did not think that there were Mennonites in this region, until we asked and discovered that this actually was the case and that a Mennonite church was in existence sixteen miles from Buffalo. Since I could not go myself but heard there was plenty of land in this community to be bought, I sent Fritz and Johannes with my church letter to the preacher of that congregation by the name of John Lapp.* They were heartily received and the preacher spent a day in going around with them in inspecting the land that could be bought. On the third day he hitched up his wagon and his two horses and himself drove with two friends to Buffalo with the intention of taking me out to see it myself. Fritz and Johannes were well pleased with this neighborhood which is beautiful and level like the country near Worms. The fine crop of standing corn was evidence of fertility. When I arrived, the friends took me to inspect several farms and we decided to buy fifty acres with buildings near to their dwelling places for $560.00. Then they hitched up two wagons and brought our baggage from Buffalo. We had lived fourteen days in Buffalo, and now we began our housekeeping on our own property, bought wheat for seed, and started the work. Since we had as yet no horses, our neighbors, brethren in the faith, plowed a nice piece of land for us, sowed it, and prepared it for a crop. Shortly thereafter we bought a team of oxen for $50.00 and sowed another piece of land."

Ten years later Krehbiel wrote a lengthy manuscript describing his impressions of the Mennonites of the United States and Canada, in response to requests from his friends and relatives in the homeland. This most interesting and valuable historical document is now in the possession of D. Theol. Christian Neff, Elder and Pastor of the Mennonite congregation at Weierhof, near Marnheim, Palatinate, Germany. Dr. Neff, one of the editors of the REVIEW, has kindly loaned the manuscript for translation and publication.

The entire manuscript contains 19 pages of finely and beautifully written material, 9 x 12 inches in size. A map of the state

* John Lapp, who in 1839 became bishop of the congregation at Clarence, Erie County, New York, was born into an Amish Mennonite family in Chester County, Pa., in 1798. He moved to Clarence, New York in 1828, was ordained preacher there before 1832, and died in 1878. For some account of his difficulties with the church, see the pertinent passages in Jacob Krehbiel's treatise following.

of New York as of that time is added to the manuscript. On this map, with accompanying annotations Krehbiel locates Clarence, his own residence, Black Rock which was the Niagara River crossing into Ontario, the Mennonite settlement at the Twenty Mile Creek (now Vineland), Ontario, the Mennonite settlement north of Toronto now called Markham, the Mennonite settlement in Waterloo County, and the small Mennonite settlements near the south end of the Welland Canal, at Black Creek, Stony Creek, and Grand River.

In the accompanying annotations the following interesting remarks are made:

"The three Mennonite churches north of Toronto are named after the townships in which they lie, as follows, Vaughan, Markham, and Pickering. Markham is the largest church, with J. Grove as bishop. In the Waterloo region where the famous Benjamin Eby is bishop, there are strong Mennonite settlements in the townships of Waterloo, Wilmot, Woolwich, and Dumfries. The church at the Twenty Mile Creek is a strong congregation. Formerly the worthy Jacob Meyer was bishop there. Jacob Gross now occupies his place, with Daniel Hoch as fellow-minister."

The numbered footnotes are a part of Krehbiel's original manuscript. All others are by the translator.

Miss F. Luella Krehbiel, Clarence Center, New York, great granddaughter of Jacob Krehbiel, Sr., the author of the original manuscript, has graciously contributed the following information about her ancestor. Jacob Krehbiel, Sr., was born at Weierhof, Palatinate, Germany, Oct. 11, 1780, and sailed from Germany with his wife and three children on June 8, 1831, originally intending to settle in Butler County, Ohio. The family arrived in New York City on July 22nd, and Buffalo on September 7th via Hudson River and Erie Canal. Krehbiel died April 4th, 1860, and was buried in the small cemetery close by the old Mennonite meetinghouse on the Greiner Road. One son, Frederick, was a deacon in the old Mennonite church, and died about 1862. His son, Jacob, Jr., was ordained a preacher in the old church about 1872. After about 8 years, he left the old church, taking a goodly number of the members with him, and affiliated shortly with the General Conference Mennonite church, having charges at Clarence Center, a place near Niagara Falls, N. Y., and at two places in Ontario, Stevensville and Black Creek. In time all of these charges died out, and Krehbiel himself died December 31, 1917.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT THE MENNONITES IN AMERICA

DEDICATION: To all my friends at Weierhof, and after reading, to be given to my friend Johannes Krehbiel III for his possession.

Clarence, New York, August 21, 1841.

Dear Friends at Weierhof:

In your letter of March 21, 1840, in reply to my letter of January 31 of this year, several questions were asked in regard

to the American Mennonites, which were occasioned by my report of my journey to Pennsylvania in the year 1839 which I had announced in the above-named letter. Since, however, it was impossible to compress the desired information about the various subjects into a letter because of the small room, I was unable to answer all of your questions. The points raised in your letter dealt with the following subjects: 1) The Inner Life, 2) Practical Christian Living, and 3) Religious Instruction of the Youth Among the Mennonites of America.

It is quite clear that any expressions or opinions in regard to the first two points will differ greatly according to whether the opinions are well-considered or merely based upon biased attitudes. The latter is often the case with conclusions drawn by new immigrants of our faith. The new immigrants are strengthened in their conclusions by the fact (which can scarcely be denied) that among the American Mennonite congregations more or less emphasis is placed upon outward forms, and that, therefore, there are frequently considerable differences between the various congregations.[1] Nevertheless, these differences are not of such significance that they have consequences harmful for the congregations except when these differences lead to actual development of parties with an ultimate schism, as actually did happen in the case of John Herr in Pennsylvania, whose followers are here known under the name of *Herreleute,* or New Mennonites.* These latter, by the way, have introduced many "reformed" practices which were hitherto unknown among the Old Mennonites (a name which we have received on account of the split of the New Mennonites).

In general, in regard to the first two points, basically only so much can be said as the impartial investigator can report as his own conclusions after having put aside prejudices; for only He who knows the hearts, to whom everything is clear, dare be judge.

The third and last point, however, that dealing with the religious instruction of the youth, is a matter of outward manifestations, and therefore, one may speak with assurance in regard to it. I will therefore attempt to disclose to you my opinions in regard to all three of these points and allow you to judge for yourself as seems best to you after giving all-around consideration to

---

[1] One dare not forget, of course, in this respect that the American Mennonites in their respective settlements often live far apart from one another (for instance, in Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio and Canada, etc.), although they remain in constant correspondence with one another.

* The John Herr schism occurred in Lancaster County in 1812. The official name of the group is The Reformed Mennonite Church.

my discussion. I had previously written something about these matters to Peter Eimann of Diemerstein, and since my opinions have not yet changed, I do not expect this report to be contrary to that one, although I no longer recall the verbal contents of that letter.

Without boasting, I nevertheless have reason to believe that among all our brethren in the faith who have immigrated to America during the last fifteen years, I have, no doubt, through correspondence and through visiting and dealing with the Mennonites of this country, had more opportunity than anyone else to observe inner conditions so far as they are concerned with church affairs, etc., and therefore, I am, of a necessity, better able to speak of their attitudes. I have attended the Conference in Canada three times and in Pennsylvania once. At these times I have frequently had opportunity to observe what principles actually furnished the foundations for the work of these gatherings, and what really are the objectives of these regularly established annual conferences. I have also had much opportunity privately at the above named places to become better acquainted with conditions and to note quietly my own opinions about them.

However, in order to make matters clear, it is necessary for me to go back to the first immigration of Mennonites to America, and not omit to say that the most of these early immigrants consisted of members of the Swiss churches who had been exiled from Switzerland and who, as is well-known, held very strictly to their church regulations. Indeed the leaders of the congregations here still endeavor to hold strictly to them. In English documents the time of the first immigration is given, I think, as about the year 1690, when several families settled in Germantown about seven miles from Philadelphia.* This settlement, however, did not become known until about the year 1700, when they attempted to form a congregation on account of additional immigration from Holland, consisting, for the most part, however, of the Swiss Mennonite exiles mentioned above. At this point, I wish to follow the account which I received from several of the oldest men in the Mennonite congregations in Montgomery county, Pennsylvania on the occasion of my visit there in 1839. The essence of this account is as follows.**

Among all the members of the Germantown congregation at

---

* Krehbiel's date is inaccurate. Germantown was settled in 1683.

** Cf. article, "An Interesting document on the Early History of Germantown," in the October, 1931, issue of the REVIEW.

the above-named time there was no one who had previously been chosen as preacher by the lot. Since they wished to follow strictly our traditional regulations in this matter, they were not willing to ordain a preacher on their own authority. They went only so far as to take votes for a preacher. These votes they sent across the ocean to their old home in Europe to their brethren in the faith with the request that their preachers cast the lot and then ordain the minister thus chosen, whereupon they were to send back to America a report of their work. This took place and accordingly the first preacher of the Mennonites in America was chosen several thousand miles distant from the congregation, in another part of the world, a procedure which should be well-recorded in history because of its unusualness.[2] Among those who told me this story was a bishop of Lower Salford, named Lederach who said that the documents dealing with this matter were still preserved in Germantown and since the congregation in that town was practically facing dissolution at this time he had often come to the thought that he should ask that the papers be handed over in order that they might be preserved in one of our congregations in Montgomery county. When I asked whether they would surrender these papers to them he answered, "Without hesitation." Whereupon I urged him to do this without delay because of the remarkableness of the whole affair. That the congregation in Germantown was facing dissolution was due to the fact that the number of members there had greatly declined and that at the present time only now and then was divine service conducted in the English language. The congregation was without any particular connection with the congregations in the neighboring counties.

The holding fast to the old regulations which I mentioned above is unmistakable among practically all of the Mennonite congregations in North America, although as mentioned before it varies more or less in different places, and it would be going too far, according to my understanding, to emphasize this too much and put the matter in the wrong light, especially since both in Canada and in the United States freedom of conscience and equality of all religions is allowed, and no one is given the least advantage by the government in regard to his Christian profession, which is not the case in Europe, as is well known.

---

[2] In the enclosed booklet entitled, *Briefe an die Mennoniten Gemeine in Oberkanada,* 1840, you can see the attitude of the Pennsylvania preachers when they received the annual request to go to the congregation at the Twenty Mile Creek in Canada and ordain a preacher for that congregation, whose members had shortly before that time emigrated thither from Pennsylvania.

If we look at the other religions for a moment we will find, for instance among the descendants of the old Puritans in New England,[3] that the principles are not yet altogether extinct which took our forefathers from England to Holland and from there to North America, as may be observed indubitably not only by a perusal of their religious periodicals but also in their demonstrations [debates. Ed.] in Congress at Washington which often appear in quite a different light than those of the representatives from the southern states, who likewise still cling to their ancestral characteristics. This is the reason for the much strife about slave holding.

But I do not wish to deny that in some American Mennonite congregations too much emphasis is placed upon outward forms, and that at times, therefore, some points seem to be exaggerated. But this is admitted by most of the preachers here themselves, and I would not want to say that even then there is no good intention at heart. Rather it is the case with a great many that they possess only to a very small degree the gift of differentiating between the greater and the less, wherefore often non-essentials are made to be essentials and consequently too much strictness is laid upon these matters, forgetting that Paul laid the first emphasis "on a new creature in Christ." Now if it should happen, unfortunately, that a Mennonite from Europe who does not like so much emphasis upon outward things, should come into contact at the outset with a preacher or a member of such a strict congregation, there arises at once a disharmony, as a result of which both sides come to false conclusions in regard to the true position of each one before they have taken time to examine the whole matter fully and take into account other congregations at other places. This is the reason for so many one-sided conceptions in Germany on the basis of reports from this side, and, vice versa, for so many one-sided conceptions here about the congregations in Germany. In truth, one must have had several years of contact and must possess the gift of impartial judgment in order to give any judgment at all. The lack of this has often brought the Mennonites into trouble. But if one should seek to find here below in this vale of our earthly pilgrimage a church without spot or wrinkle, he might as well and as easily try to find the lost paradise on earth. This is recognized by preachers and members with insight in this country. Just in this connection I recall what a preacher in Ohio once said to another

---

[3] The northeastern states of the Union are usually designated by the name "New England."

preacher in the state of New York when the latter was complaining about various matters of this nature, whereupon the former replied: "If there should be a church so holy, pure, without blame or defect, and you and I should join this church, then it would no longer be pure and blameless, for you and I would be a part of it." Could he well have given a more fitting reply, and would this not be the case among all Christian churches on the entire globe, in spite of all the advantages which one could claim for himself in any way whatever. For this reason also Paul admonishes us to deal gently with the weak in faith.

A major point of accusation against the American Mennonites concerns the clothes question, and not altogether without justification. However, in this connection one must remember that different conditions exist in various places, as I have already indicated several times. In many places in Pennsylvania there is no difference between the costume worn by the Mennonites and that worn by other people in America and Germany. But this is not the case in all the congregations either in Pennsylvania or in other states as well as in Canada, since in some places more attention is devoted to this point than at others. Before I deal further with this matter, I want to give you an extract from a letter from Johannes Risser of Richland Co., Ohio, formerly of Friedelsheim (Germany), in order that I may not withhold from you anything which I know in this regard. Although Risser could not unite with the Mennonites there (as also his brother, Jacob Risser, formerly from Buedesheim, and other German Mennonites living there could not) we have nevertheless continued up to the present in correspondence with each other. In his letter of March 1, 1837, he treats the subject of clothes in the following manner:—

"I once had the opportunity to speak with a preacher about church discipline in connection with clothes. I expressed the opinion that it was better and more beneficial if the preacher should not go further than to admonish in love, and should altogether omit punishment, leaving to the conscience of the people to follow or not to follow his admonition. In this connection I related several examples out of my own experience which proved plainly enough that punishment can easily bring nothing but harm. To this I immediately received contradiction without any consideration or examination of my point and soon I had the following answer: 'I would not believe that one could be a true Christian and wear such a hat and coat.' (He referred to some young people sitting near us who were still wearing the ordinary hat and coat as commonly worn,

since they were not yet baptized although they were already in young manhood.) I was deeply shocked at this and did not care to continue the discussion any further. Of course if the man was right the logical conclusion to be drawn is that church discipline must deal with this matter and must punish. Likewise is the conclusion logical that such punishment is beneficial and that one brings nothing but good thereby. It follows further that one likewise renders a service to God thereby, and that, accordingly, there is not necessarily any unloving aspect to the whole thing. This preacher is older than I and has occupied the office of bishop for several years. It is needless to waste any words about his opinion; I merely give you this example because it shows so clearly where prejudices and erroneous ideas about Christianity can lead to, and how harmful these are."

So much for the extract from Risser's letter. But that clothes are a fundamental matter in Christianity I have never heard defended either here or at other places, although I have often heard it said that excessive display in clothing manifests on the outside what is hidden within the heart, and on the other hand that an inner pride in plain clothing is much more dangerous than the outward glitter. We here have no prescribed form of clothing but are rather warned against pride. Never have I heard in any of the conferences which I have attended any degree of punishment administered on this point. Everything which I have previously experienced in this connection consisted of friendly corrections. I remember particularly what the departed bishop at the Twenty Mile Creek, Jacob Meyer, said to me once, namely, that in this matter one must never proceed with harshness (*Strenge*) but with gentle corrections in love; and this is likewise the opinion of Benjamin Eby in Waterloo.* In Pennsylvania where I also discussed this matter with the preachers, they expressed themselves in a similar manner: that harshness in this respect was always more harmful than beneficial, and that they could no longer bring things back to the simple way in which the old brethren and predecessors had administered things without creating division in the church, and this would be much worse. The above-mentioned expression of the preacher in Ohio quoted by J. Risser would accordingly not be met with in these latter places.

---

* Benjamin Eby, born in Lancaster County, Pa., migrated to Waterloo in 1806, where he was ordained first bishop of the Mennonite Church in Canada in 1812. He was the greatest figure in the Canada conference. He died in 1853.

The American Mennonite preachers do unitedly testify against display in clothing (*Kleiderpracht*) although this is done for the most part in moderation; it is true that both are necessary. But in order to speak accurately about these things one must know circumstances and conditions better, in order not to get off the track on either side. I do not really know how things now are in Germany, but I do know how they were ten years ago and can therefore say that fashionable clothing in the rural sections of America far exceeds what I saw in my time in the country in Germany.

Here the folk in the country ape after the city people, especially the women. I do not wish to enter into any extensive description of this but only wish to remark that the evil of desire for display (*Prachtsucht*) has already cost many families fine farms and brought them into the most needy circumstances. The "English" suffer especially from this evil, and the "Germans" like to ape after them. Of all this I myself have been witness. Now if preachers want to remain true to their duties in temporal as well as spiritual things, they must fight against this enemy which is of no help at all in spiritual matters and even undermines the temporal fortune of families. But to try to change the ordinary country clothing would be foolishness and have little value.

However, the fact that here and there there are radicals on this question who exceed the limits of moderation should not lead to a general condemnation of all and should likewise not modify or change anything which I have said previously. Do we not find exceptions in everything and must we not deal with them accordingly? Why should we not do likewise in this matter?

In the matter of the use of the sword and political office, testimony is given everywhere against these two things. The first is contrary to the principle of nonresistance and the second touches closely the swearing of oaths, although according to the constitution, the government cannot force the oath upon any official when he assumes office, but rather permits a simple affirmation in the case of conscientious scruples. It is really the lowest office, that of justice of the peace, which would be easiest for Mennonites in the country to occupy, but it is so closely connected with the oath that this official must constantly administer oaths to other people. Similar conditions exist with regard to many offices. Now if one holds that the oath is contrary to the teaching of Christ for oneself, how could one administer this same oath to others? For this reason such an official would be expelled from the church without hesitation. It is not forbidden, however, to serve on the jury at the

order of the government. In this case a simple affirmation is permitted. There have been cases of Mennonites who came from Germany who took the oath, but you can see from the above how this was dealt with.

Suing at law is likewise not permitted on the basis of I Cor. 6; in this case, however, there is no excommunication from the church but rather a simple "setting-back," which may be again withdrawn upon the confession of transgression. In connection with debt collections, however, it is very easy to avoid a suit. Usually when a debt arises out of a commercial deal or sale, a so-called note is given, consisting of a few lines acknowledging the debt, followed by signature. If the note has fallen due, there are always people who are willing to buy such a note or one can use the note to make payment instead of currency, if the signer of the note is good for it. This custom is quite widely practiced here, and no one is condemned for it. Personal difficulties are often settled by arbitration and, if they concern people outside the church, there are always persons of other religions who may be found to help.

In regard to marriages outside the church the practice here is just as it was when I was in Germany: in such a case the guilty party is excommunicated. The marriage ceremony in this case is never performed by a Mennonite preacher. Usually such people go to a minister of another denomination or the justice of the peace. Acceptance in the church later is customary.[4]

In this connection I should like to remark that marriage of people who have come of age is not hindered in any way by the authorities; parents cannot interfere. In order to give you a better conception here, I want to turn aside for a little while to give you the following story. This case took place a few years ago in our neighborhood. When the youngest son of a farmer left the breakfast table one morning he said, "Father, to-day I am going to get married; do you want to go along?" The father who had not known the least about this before, I am told, saddled his horse and rode off to Williamsburg to where the bride and her parents lived and the wedding was to take place. Whether he was present at the ceremony, I cannot say for a certainty. I have not heard of any objection on his part, although the wealth of the daughter-in-law was quite small compared with his own. He owns about 900

---

4 The 26th question in the Gerhart Roosen book for confirmation catechism is still answered with "No" in the American catechism.*

* The Roosen Catechism was first published in Hamburg-Altona in 1702 as *Christliches Gemuethsgespraech.* The first American edition was at Ephrata in 1769. It became very popular among the American Mennonites and was often reprinted.

acres of land in four farms which his three living children or their descendants are to inherit. All this land is free of debt. I know the man well although he is not of our faith.

In regard to baptism, there was no noticeable difference in this ceremony from the practice in Germany until a few years ago when a number of people both here and in Canada, some of them already married, requested at the time of their reception into the church to be baptised "in water with water." Here I must turn aside a bit and explain something about the baptismal practices of other denominations in America. The baptismal practices of those churches having infant baptism is of course of no concern to us here. I speak only of those who practice baptism of adults. Of these there are many churches in addition to the Mennonite church. Practice is quite varied. In the first place there is the baptismal practice as it is now commonly carried out and is practiced by us. In the second place there is the practice of baptism "in water with water," which is called "pouring." In this case, preachers and candidates for baptism proceed to a flowing stream where those to be baptised kneel down and the preacher likewise goes into the water. The preacher then dips water and pours the same upon the head of the candidate with the usual ritual. The third form of baptism is immersion in which the preacher with the candidates repairs to a body of water. He takes a candidate in with him, bends the candidate backward altogether into the water and lays him down so that water completely covers his face and body, using at the same time the customary words, and then quickly lifts him up again. The three forms of baptism noted are called by the American as follows: sprinkling, pouring, and immersion. Now I can go on with the discussion as interrupted above.

A number here and in Canada requested to be baptised "in water with water." They were perhaps led to this request by several passages in the New Testament referring to the practice in that time. But, since this form of baptism was hitherto unknown to the Mennonites, the preachers objected to it. Their objection, however, did not settle the question since the candidate to be baptised insisted upon the new form. The entire question was postponed until the next general gathering or conference. This was held in Canada at the Twenty Mile Creek Church.[5] I was present at this conference. Many insisted upon holding to the form previously in use claiming that, if the baptismal vow was not carried

[5] The annual conferences are held as follows: this year at Markham, next year in Waterloo, and the third year at the Twenty Mile Creek.

out, the baptism would remain without value anyway since necessarily a change of heart must take place. This principle was recognized of course as scriptural, but several brought up the question as to whether it was right to place a burden on the conscience since no outside form is expressly prescribed in the New Testament. Finally after much discussion a decision was made that the form of baptism hitherto in use should be held to in the main, namely, if the candidate should not especially insist on being baptised "in water with water." If he should insist, however, upon his preference for the new form, this should be allowed. Thereupon a number were baptised according to the new form, although not many, since in Canada the candidates are often baptised before their twentieth year.

When I was in Pennsylvania where they still hold to the customary form of baptism, I once began to discuss this question. The opinion was favorable to not burdening the conscience, but they thought that there should have been further consideration of the matter before permission was given, especially in the light of the above fact [apparently referring to the usual age of baptism. Ed.].

In the United States and Canada there is no definite age appointed by the Mennonites for reception into the church through baptism. The candidate is supposed to feel the necessity of baptism himself and come when he is ready. Yet I noticed in Pennsylvania and Canada a number baptised under the age of twenty. It is understood of course that baptism never takes place too early in life, not before the candidates themselves understand the meaning of the ceremony. Further discussion of this point is perhaps not in place here. The preparation for baptism will be dealt with below in the discussion of the instruction of the youth.

(To be continued)

RESEARCH NOTES

MENNONITICA CREFELDENSIS

"Die Heimat", Mitteilungen der Vereine für Heimatkunde in Krefeld-Uerdingen am Rhein (Subscription price, $2.00 per year) is a patriotic periodical devoted to research in the local history of a section of the German Rhine territory with Krefeld, the renowned settlement of Dutch Mennonites, as its center. This journal is not only of interest to friends of Mennonite history because of the Krefeld-Germantown (1683) relationship. It has an additional attraction for the reasons that its editor, Professor Karl Rembert, happens to be the author of *Die "Wiedertäufer" im Herzogtum Juelich,* Berlin, 1899, still the first and authoritative description of the early and later history of Mennonites in the Lower Rhine section. Inasmuch as Mennonites were and to some extent still are shaping the history of Krefeld, this personal interest of Dr. Rembert has always caused *Mennonitica Krefeldensis* to have a prominent place in *Die Heimat.* The issue of July 15, 1931, (Jahrgang 10, Heft 2) is of particular interest as it is devoted to the first German (Mennonite) settlers in America, following the placement in the Krefeld Museum of a bronze reproduction of the so-called Pastorius monument of Philadelphia created by J. Otto Schweizer. The *Wyomissing* and *Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation for the Development of Cultural Relations between the United States and Germany* were instrumental in making this happy gift to Krefeld, Germany. The monument bears among other inscriptions this statement: "In commemoration of the landing on October 6, 1683, of the founders of Germantown after a sea-voyage of 74 days on the ship 'Concord,' also in commemoration of the first entirely German settlement on American soil. They were received by the magnanimous jurist, Franz Daniel Pastorius." There are added the names of the first Mennonite settlers. Dr. Rembert exerted much effort in presenting in this issue of *Die Heimat* the proceedings of the various activities in connection with the presentation of the reproduction, including the speech of the German-American historian, Rudolf Cronau, New York City, and his own, as Director of the Museum. Both gentlemen naturally stress the Mennonite aspects of the settlement. Mr. Cronau especially points to the famous protest against slavery which had originated in the Germantown Mennonite group. "The importation of negro slaves from Africa into the British colonies . . . was not objected to by the English sects of the Puritan and Friends type. Although these defended human rights, they did not see any injustice in the trade in human life. Only the Mennonites of Germantown, having suffered much oppression in their home country, realized that slavery is against the teachings of Christianity and, therefore, should be abolished. They occupied themselves energetically with this question and caused Pastorius to draft a protest in the English language which was later submitted to the monthly meeting of the Friends in Philadelphia in February 1688" (page 82). Dr. Rembert tells of the Krefeld background of the first settlers. Reproductions from the title page of the *Blutige Schauplatz oder Maertyrerspiegel* are given.

The same issue also contains: *"Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mennoniten in Krefeld und Umgegend. Besuch des Königs Friedrich Wilhelm I*

in Krefeld (1738)" (Pages 88-98) to which original report is attached an article from the *Krefelder Zeitung* of October 31, 1929, entitled *Viersen nach dem Dreissigjährigen Kriege.* Archives of the city of Viersen show the intimate connection between Mennonite communities in Viersen, Haarlem, (Holland) and Krefeld in the second half of the 18th century. Another article reproduced by Dr. Rembert in this memorial comes from the late historian Hermann Keussen (*Krefelder Zeitung,* 1894, No. 421): *Ein Aktenstück über die erste Einwanderung der Mennoniten im Jahre* 1655 *und über die damit verknüpften Vorgänge.* The reprinting of these very informative articles is much to be appreciated as they are otherwise hardly accessible. Dr. Rembert added several footnotes of great value. There is also reproduced the beautiful portal of the Krefeld Mennonite church erected in 1695 (page 91).

The same issue gives the memoirs of H. R., an employee of Jacob von Beckerath (1792-1863): *Im Dienste der Krefelder Sammet- und Sammetbandfabrik Jacob von Beckerath, Johs. Sohn,* an interesting description of this now extinct Mennonite manufacturing concern.

Die Heimat in this as in its other issues illustrating Krefeld, the old Mennonite center, cannot be disregarded by students of Mennonite history. Dr. Rembert deserves praise for the work he does, and whatever support is given to his undertaking is for a worthy cause.

Washington, D. C. Ernst Correll, *American University.*

THE STUDY OF THE PENNSYLVANIA-GERMAN DIALECT

A special line of investigation that can be profitably carried on along with the other historical studies that are being made of the Mennonites in America is the study of the Pennsylvania-German dialect as it has been spoken in the past and is still being spoken to-day in many of the Mennonite and Amish settlements. It is well known that the use of this colloquial dialect has not been without its influence upon the life of the communities in which it has been used, particularly upon the social and religious attitudes that prevail among them. The linguistic phenomena which the dialect presents are also of significance and as such they are worthy of careful study and of permanent record.

In Pennsylvania and Maryland the Pennsylvania-German dialect is found in general use over very large areas. The communities in the states farther to the west that were established during the nineteenth century by Mennonite and Amish-Mennonite settlers from the original centers constitute small language islands, as it were, of the dialect. Upon these islands the surrounding ocean of American speech is constantly encroaching from all sides. This encroachment takes several forms. For one thing it tends to modify the dialect itself as it survives from one generation to the next. On the other hand it also threatens to displace the dialect gradually with colloquial English as in the course of time fewer from the rising generation learn to speak the dialect of their fathers.

The student of linguistic science is particularly interested in the first of the tendencies named above: the gradual and continual changes that occur within the dialect as it is used in different communities. In the western settlements this use is limited almost entirely to domestic and

social circles. At the same time English is a second language with practically all that speak the Pennsylvania-German because of the fact that all reading and writing done by them as well as all their formal education are in English. In some places literary German is still read by the older people, but the influence of this factor upon the dialect is rapidly passing out.

It is common knowledge that the presence of a literature and the pursuit of formal education constantly inhibit the natural tendencies that are at work to produce changes in a language as it is spoken colloquially. In the absence of a literature and of formal education in a spoken dialect, linguistic changes are constantly and rapidly taking place. Since all of these conditions apply to the Pennsylvania-German, this dialect affords an interesting laboratory demonstration of basic linguistic phenomena and a splendid opportunity to study and observe first-hand the principles and laws of linguistic change.

So by way of illustration attention may here be called to a few of the changes that are obvious even to the casual observer of the dialect. Such an one is the tendency to replace dialect words by English loan-words, as well as the wholesale adoption of English words for objects and experiences that are very modern. In accordance with the principle of German grammar that every noun has grammatical gender, the English nouns that are taken into the Pennsylvania-German dialect have in use a grammatical gender assigned to them. So, for example, one would be quite likely to hear the words *automobile* and *typewriter* used in the masculine gender, *train* and *creek* in the feminine, *buggy* and *bookkeeping* in the neuter. The gender assigned to particular nouns is not necessarily uniform among all users. In numerous other ways we find German and dialectical grammar principles applied to the English loan-words that become a part of the spoken dialect. Sound shifts and changes in pronunciation, shifts in the meaning and usage of the dialect words are other tendencies that are worthy of note and study. The syntax of English, ever present as a second language, is also not without its influence upon the syntactical practice of this dialect.

Obviously if these interesting facts are to be made available for the use of linguistic science in general, they must be studied and duly recorded while they are still available. The western communities of Mennonites and Amish-Mennonites are already from two to four or more generations removed from the original settlements in Pennsylvania, and changes have been made in the Pennsylvania-German they speak, where it is still spoken at all. It is even possible to detect slight dialectical variations between the different lines of migration from an original center.

Various studies of the Pennsylvania-German dialect as such have already been made, mostly in the eastern states where the dialect is more common. For the most part these studies have been lexicographical rather than broadly linguistic. An outstanding work on the subject is M. B. Lambert's *Pennsylvania-German Dictionary*, published, 1924, by the Pennsylvania-German Society at Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The preface to this book (pages v-xxviii) has a brief discussion of the dialect and its history, its phonology and orthography, and also gives references to other studies that have been made in this field.

An attempt to study the dialect in a local western community has been made by Miss Ruth Bender, who prepared a Master's thesis for the English department of the State University of Iowa in 1929, entitled *A Study of the Pennsylvania-German Dialect as Spoken in Johnson County, Iowa* (unpublished). After some very brief historical and grammatical notes, the thesis presents, in alphabetical order, more than two thousand words taken from the oral speech of the community. The words included are mostly the simple forms found in everyday use; very few compound words are admitted and scarcely any English loan-words at all. The words are spelled first with the Continental vowel system. Each word is then also written in the phonetic alphabet of the International Phonetic System. Thereupon follow a few grammatical notations and the meaning of each word in English. The orthography of Pennsylvania-German words has not been standardized as yet. Mr. Lambert contends for the basic German spelling which he employs in his Dictionary. Miss Bender's practice of writing the dialect words also in phonetic script is very essential for linguistic purposes and is to be highly commended.

The effort represented in this thesis is entirely praiseworthy. The method used is correct in principle. One regrets, however, that it has been applied with hardly sufficient care and thoroughness in every instance for completely reliable results. The small details are the matters that have real significance for comparing the dialect spoken in one community with that used in other sections as well as for discovering the tendencies toward linguistic change that are at work. Consequently too great pains cannot be exercised to insure accuracy both in observing the usage of the dialect and in making record of the result. It is to be hoped that this effort will lead the way for other studies of the same nature and will serve to stimulate other students to carry on research in this promising field.

Since the writer of these notes was himself reared in the community where Miss Bender's study was made, I have taken a very special interest in her thesis and also a certain liberty, pardonable, I hope, in comparing the recorded observations with my own *Sprachgefuehl*. It was with a sense of satisfaction that the comparison showed agreement most of the time. Occasionally, however, the meanings given to dialect words raise a question, usually when only a very specialized meaning is recorded which wider observation would supplement and correct. Again in a few instances I have felt constrained to call into question certain of the grammatical data set forth or the pronunciation of certain words. By checking up very carefully on doubtful points through repeated observations with different individuals in different homes, the accuracy of the thesis could doubtless have been improved. There is one point on which I suspect an appreciable percentage of errors. I refer to the gender recorded for the nouns. In rather wide samplings, I was inclined to challenge the gender given for an average of two nouns on each page of the manuscript. In comparing the gender as given in Mr. Lambert's Dictionary for the nouns in question, my own feeling was confirmed in most of the instances. Again this may not prove faulty observation and an inaccurate record on the author's part. It is entirely possible that the nouns in question vary in respect to the gender in which they are used. In the case that extensive observation reveals a persistent variation on this point, then it is essential

that careful record be made of the fact. It is a matter of great interest to linguistic science.

A thorough study could well be made of the gender of the English nouns used in the dialect as loan-words. Albert W. Aron, of the University of Illinois, has made an extensive study of the gender of English loan-words in colloquial American-German as it is spoken in some of the middle western states. This study is published in the *Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies,* issued as Language Monograph, No. 7 (December, 1930) by the Linguistic Society of America (Philadelphia). The results of the study will be very useful for purposes of comparison with a similar investigation of the gender of English loan-words in the Pennsylvania-German dialect.

Hesston, Kansas. Edward Yoder, *Hesston College.*

BOOKS

Centennial History of the Mennonites of Illinois 1829-1929. By HARRY F. WEBER, Ph.D. (Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, No. 3) Published by the Mennonite Historical Society, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana. 1931, pp. xvi, 680. Price $4.00.

"Of the making of many books", some one said many years ago, "there is no end". This is coming to be as true of Mennonites and Mennonitism as of any other field of study. Within the past month there have come to the desk of the reviewer three new books on Mennonites by Mennonites, and two notices of others to appear soon. These all cover the field of Mennonite history. Fortunately most of these new works are written by aspirants for the Ph.D. degree, thus insuring that impartial treatment and scholarly detachment toward the subject which is so essential to an accurate history of a religious group so full of controversy as has been the case among the Mennonites.

The book under review—*Centennial History of the Mennonites of Illinois,* by Dr. Harry F. Weber, himself a native of Illinois, but now on the faculty of Pennsylvania State Teachers College at Lock Haven, Pa., is of this character. It covers the whole range of Illinois Mennonite History, the first settlers, their religious and secular life and their organized religious activities. All the various branches are included in an impartial and fairminded manner—the Amish Mennonites, the Old Order Amish, Conservative Amish, The Defenseless, Reformed, and General Conference Mennonites, and the (old) Mennonites. For the last mentioned group Dr. Weber like other writers before him finds himself at a loss to decide upon an appropriate distinctive prefix. The official title of plain Mennonite demanded by the leaders of the group hardly suffices when the various branches are discussed in any general treatment, so he decides on what is probably the best name, "old" Mennonite.

The Mennonites of Illinois were among the pioneer settlers of the state. The first congregations were nearly all located on virgin soil. They helped to clear the primeval forests along the river banks and creek bottoms and were the first to turn under the virgin prairie sod. The Amish near what is now Metamora established in 1833 what is thought to be the

first German church in the state. They have ever since been among the best of Illinois farmers, and they are usually found where agricultural values are the highest.

While the book in the main, after the manner of local histories in general, concerns itself chiefly with names and dates of early settlers, ministers, Sunday School superintendents, presidents of Ladies Sewing Societies, choristers and other church dignitaries, (nobody seems to be left out), yet the author in his extensive quest for facts has rescued from oblivion and perpetuated for the future the memory of many extremely interesting and significant bits of church practise and religious tradition that without his efforts would have been lost for good.

Interesting is the description of the extinct congregations at Scales Mound, and at Gardner, and the fact that in 1864 John F. Funk organized a church in Chicago, and issued the first copies of the *Herald of Truth* there. Much of the story of Joseph Stuckey is here told for the first time; and it will no doubt be news to many of the younger generation who know anything at all about the founding of the Central Conference that Stuckey was a preacher in good standing among the conservative Amish churches of northern Indiana, and preached for them as late as 1882, ten years after his so called expulsion from the Amish "Diener Versammlung." The account of the work of Kauffman, the sleeping preacher, has never appeared in print before. Many choice bits of description taken from various conference reports enliven the pages of the book, and might well serve to give those of us who are inclined to be pessimistic of the future a little more confidence in the integrity of the present youthful generation. The good old days are not all in the past. One of the resolutions passed in the (old) Mennonite conference held in Sterling in 1873 recommended that all the ministers suggest to their tobacco chewing members that they help "keep the house of worship in a clean and orderly condition."

With all these interesting glimpses into the past which the book contains yet it seems to the reviewer that there are many details, names and dates and irrelevant information that might well have been omitted without in any way detracting from either its interest or usefulness. Such statements as these—the Old People's Home at Eureka is surrounded by fifty native shade trees; there are 129 graves in the Tiskilwa church yard; the old Flanagan church was 32 by 48 feet in size, with a small addition to the rear with permanent wooden seats and a stove for heating; in the Hopedale congregation each year two sisters are appointed to keep the house clean. Perhaps there is a little more excuse for the information that in the old Yoder congregation in the early days "the pigs from the timber would sometimes seek shelter or shade under the church on Sundays and disturb the meeting". The author of course depended for his information of the various settlements on local historians, and sometimes forgot to edit and digest thoroughly the papers sent in to him for his use. It is not always easy to decide whether an opinion expressed in the book is his own or that of some biased contributor. Such a case is the miraculous discovery of the middle name of John R. Zook by the Sleeping Preacher group. (page 558).

Of course a book with so many detailed facts, dates and names will of necessity have a few mistakes. There is no evidence that the Lancaster Conference began in 1725. There are a few typographical errors.

Goles county should be Coles; Porduan (58) should be Pordenau; Older (234) should be Ioder; Fairburg (468) is Fairbury; Fleiser (214) evidently is meant for Heiser. The editor is correct in his suggestion that Befford should be Belfort (83).

These slight errors of course are inevitable. No one person is supposed to know everything. The wonder is that the errors are so few. Every first edition contains a considerable number of mistakes of one kind and another; and to call attention to such is really beyond the province of a review.

Dr. Weber has done the cause of Mennonite history and the Mennonites of Illinois especially a most valuable service. It is from works such as this that the final history of the whole Mennonite movement must be written. It is hoped that many more such local histories may be undertaken by young men scholarly inclined. The work is scholarly, reliable and complete, and no doubt final.

Great credit is due also to the Mennonite Historical Society of Goshen College for making the book available to the public. It is published as volume number three in the *Studies in Anabaptist* and *Mennonite History*. This Society is already the leading force in America in the promotion of Mennonite historical literature, and the publishing of this book is a fine example of the service it is rendering the cause.

Bluffton, Ohio. C. Henry Smith, *Bluffton College.*

EDITORIAL

(Continued from page 4)

he failed to do all these things, so we must be content and grateful for the interesting and valuable accounts of the church life and practices which he thought worthy of note and the conscientious manner of his writing.

Notable is the indication by Krehbiel that the life of the church was not closely fettered by conference organization, and regulations, but that the direction of this life still lay largely in the hands of leaders who exercised influence because of their ability and sound wisdom. Notable is also the indication to two tendencies, one toward more mechanical and traditional attitudes and one toward more spiritual and evangelical attitudes. The conflict between these two tendencies is no doubt eternal in the history of the Christian church, as it seems to be in the Mennonite portion of the Lord's vineyard. Krehbiel's heart was right in longing for men of the type of Dillman Moyer of the "Twenty" and Benjamin Eby of Waterloo. These are needed to-day as always, but particularly to-day.

The Krehbiel document will be concluded in the next issue.

IT WILL BE WORTH WHILE NOT TO OVERLOOK THE *Research Notes* by Dr. Correll and Dr. Yoder, as well as the book review by Dr. Smith.